

THE CLERGY REVIEW

A MAGAZINE FOR THE CLERGY

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

VOLUME VI, No. 6.

DECEMBER, 1933.

Proprietors

"THE UNIVERSE,"

(Associated Catholic Newspapers, 1912, Ltd.)

1, Arundel Street, London, W.C.2

BOOKS RECEIVED

THE SERVANT OF THE SACRED HEART, Selections from the Sermons and Meditations of the Blessed Claude de la Colombiere, S.J. Translated and edited by the Rev. George O'Neill, S.J. (London: Sands & Co. pp. xiii. and 183. 3s. 6d.)

THE LIFE AND WORK OF REV. MOTHER MECHTILDE OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT (Catherine de Bar) 1614-1698, Foundress of the Institute of the Benedictines of the Perpetual Adoration. By a Nun of the Benedictine Community, Dumfries. (London: Sands & Co. pp. 336. 7s. 6d.)

PRACTICAL HINTS ON PREACHING, A Simple Handbook for Beginners, by the Rev. Aloysius Roche. (London: Sands & Co. pp. xii. and 192. 3s. 6d.)

THE INEVITABLE CROSS, by W. E. Orchard D.D. (London: Sands & Co. pp. xviii. and 273. 7s. 6d.)

A MAP OF LIFE, by F. J. Sheed. (London: Sheed & Ward. pp. 147. 3s. 6d.)

THE JEWISH BACKGROUND OF CHRISTIANITY, by the Rev. N. Levison, B.D. A Manual of the Political, Social and Literary Life of the Jews from 586 B.C. to A.D. 1. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. pp. xvi. and 205. 5s.)

LE PRETRE FRANCIAS ET LA SOCIETE CONTEMPORAINE, par M. l'Abbé J. Bruguerette. I. La Restauration Catholique, 1815-1871. (Paris: P. Lethielleux. pp. viii. and 308. 30 frs.)

THE PREVENTION OF WAR BY COLLECTIVE ACTION, by the Right Hon. Lord Howard of Penrith. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne. pp. 23. 6d.)

DEUX AMES VERS LES CIMES, Histoire Vécue, par G. Joannès. (Paris: Pierre Téqui. pp. 234. 10 frs.)

THE WAY OF THE QUEEN, by the Rev. Father Martin Dempsey, M.A. (London: Washbourne & Bogan. pp. xii. and 203. 3s. 6d.)

THE IDEA OF GOD IN BRITISH AND AMERICAN PERSONAL IDEALISM, by the Rev. Gerald Thomas Baskfield, S.T.L. (Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C. pp. x. and 137.)

THE CATHOLIC ALMANACK for 1934, compiled by the Editor of the *Catholic Directory*. (London: Burns Oates and Washbourne. pp. 64. 2d.)

THE CATHOLIC DIARY for 1934. (London: Burne Oates & Washbourne. Cloth, 1s.; Leather, 2s. 6d.)

LE PROBLEME DU MAL, par M. l'Abbé Albert Ryckmans. (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer. pp. 204. 10.50 frs.)

CHRISTIANITY AND ECONOMICS, by A. D. Lindsay, LL.D. (London: Macmillan. pp. vii. and 177. 5s.)

SUMMA THEOLOGIAE MORALIS ad mentem d. Thomae et ad normam Juris Novi, quam in usum scholarum, edidit Benedictus Henricus Merkelbach, O. P. Tomus Tertius et Ultimus: De Sacramentis. (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer & Cie. pp. 960. 40 frs.)

JESUS CHRIST: HIS LIFE, HIS TEACHING, HIS WORK, by Auguste Reatz. Translated by Mary Sands and edited by the Rev. G. Brinkworth, S.J. (London: Sands & Co. pp. xii. and 375. 10s. 6d.)

JESUS CHRIST: SA VIE, SA DOCTRINE, SON ŒUVRE, par le R. P. Ferdinand Prat, S.J. Deux volumes. (Paris: G. Beauchesne. pp. 594 and 594.)

THE LITURGICAL ALTAR, by Geoffrey Webb. Illustrated. (London: Washbourne & Bogan. pp. xiv. and 112. 5s.)

DIRECTIONS FOR THE USE OF ALTAR SOCIETIES AND ARCHITECTS. First compiled under the direction of the late Cardinal Vaughan. New edition (Fourth). Revised and enlarged. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne. pp. xiv. and 66. 2s. 6d.)

THE LIFE OF ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST, by the Very Rev. Denis Buzy. Freely adapted with much additional matter by the Rev. John M. T. Barton, D.D. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne. pp. xx and 283. 7s. 6d.)

GOD, MAN AND SOCIETY. An Introduction to Christian Sociology, by V. A. Demant, B.Litt., B.Sc. (London: Student Christian Movement Press. pp. 224. 6s.)

THE NEW PSYCHOLOGY AND RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE, by Thomas Hywel Hughes, M.A., D.Litt., D.D. (London: Allen & Unwin. pp. 332. 10s. 6d.)

YOUTH IN SOVIET RUSSIA, by Klaus Mehnert. Translated by Michael Davidson. (London: Allen & Unwin. pp. 27). 7s. 6d.)

ROMANTICISM OF HOLINESS, by the Rev. Father James, O.M.Cap. (London: Sands & Co. pp. 238. 5s.)

CANTERBURY ADMINISTRATION, The Administrative Machinery of the Archbishopric of Canterbury, illustrated from original records, by Irene Josephine Churchill, D.Phil., F.R.Hist.S. Two volumes. (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. pp. xiii. and 615, and xvi. and 367. 42s.)

THE CATHOLIC MEDICAL GUARDIAN

Vol. XI. No. 4. *The Quarterly Journal of the Guild of St. Luke, St. Cosmas, and St. Damian.* October, 1933.

LEADING ARTICLE.—Biological Warfare.
SPECIAL ARTICLES.—(1) Catholic Doctors Confer in Dublin (with photograph). (2) Scientific Jargon. (3) The International Congress of Catholic Physicians. (4) Doctors and the Church. (5) The German Law for the Prevention of Hereditary Diseases. (6) Fewer Births mean Greater Unemployment. (7) The International Congress of Catholic Nurses.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.—Public Resolution Concerning the "Catholic Medical Guardian." The Master of the Guild. Euthanasia in Prussia. Medical Practice in India. Communications for the Guardian.
ORIGINAL ARTICLES.—(1) Diabolical Possession. By Rev. C. W. Howell, S.J., M.Sc. (2) A Critical Consideration of the De Rudder Case. By Dr. F. M. R. Walshe. (3) The Sociological Aspects of Medico-Moral

Problems. By Rev. J. Arthur O'Connor.
REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS.—(1) The Sterile Period in Family Life. By Very Rev. Canon Valere J. Coucke and James J. Walshe, M.D., Ph.D. (2) Man and Medicine. By Dr. Henry E. Sigerist. (3) Surgical Nursing: arranged according to the Unit Method by Sister Mary Florence, R.S.M. (4) Clinical Studies for Nurses, etc., etc.
Publishers: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., London: 43, 44, 45, Newgate Street, E.C.1, 129, Victoria Street, S.W.1, 33, Ashley Place, S.W.1. And at Manchester, Birmingham and Glasgow.
Price: 1s. 4d. Annually 5s. (Post Free).
Subscription for United States \$1.50. All enquiries to: Editorial & Manager's Offices, 3, St. John's Road, Harrow-on-the-Hill, Middlesex.

FRANCIS TUCKER & CO.

ESTABLISHED 1730 LTD.
Manufacturers of Genuine Beeswax Candles

ALSO SUPPLY
FRAGRANT INCENSE
IN SEVERAL QUALITIES, AND
CHARCOAL for use with INCENSE
OF VARIOUS KINDS.

Cricklewood Lane, London, N.W.2

Telephone: SPEEDWELL 6227
Telegrams: ENLIGHTEN, LONDON



CHALICES (from £4-4-0)
CIBORIA, MONSTRANCES
and all Church Silver and Metal
Work. Send for book 16.
MEMORIAL TABLETS IN BRASS, etc.
from £3. Send for Book 36 to
Actual Makers.
F. OSBORNE & CO. LTD.
27, Eastcastle Street,
Oxford Circus, London, W.1

John Hardman's

John T. Hardman 43, Newhall-Hill
Dunstan J. Powell Birmingham &
Elphège J. Pippet Paintings Mosaics 1, Albemarle
John Hardman St. Piccadilly
& Co. Limited Church Decoration London, W.1
Private Compy

R. L. BOULTON & SONS

Catholic Art Sculptors,

Bath Road, CHELTENHAM

ALTARS, Etc., in MARBLE,
STONE or WOOD.

GERALD J. HARDMAN,

5a, Temple-row, BIRMINGHAM.

Telephone: Central 3753.

All kinds of Church Furniture,
Metal Work, Carving in Wood and
Stone, Renovations, Gilding, &c.

CHURCH BUILDINGS IN NEW HOUSING AREAS

HARBROW'S

TEMPORARY AND
SEMI-PERMANENT
BUILDINGS AFFORD
DURABLE, EFFICIENT,
ECONOMICAL AND
EXPEDITIOUS MEANS
OF MEETING ALL
REQUIREMENTS.

ESTD. 50 YEARS.



Semi-permanent Church.

Write for Suggestions, Estimates and Drawings.
Dept. U.

WILLIAM HARBROW, Ltd.

**SOUTH BERMONDSEY,
LONDON — S.E.16**



7
1
C
1
1
C
1
3
4
8
1
3
6

THE CLERGY REVIEW

THE OXFORD MOVEMENT THEN & NOW

BY THE REV. T. E. FLYNN, Ph.D., M.A.

The Oxford Movement, by J. Lewis May. The Bodley Head. 10s. 6d.

The Oxford Movement, 1833-1933, by Shane Leslie. Burns Oates & Washbourne. 5s.

The Spirit of the Oxford Movement, by Christopher Dawson. Sheed & Ward. 3s. 6d.

The Secret Story of the Oxford Movement, by the Rev. Desmond Morse-Boycott. Skeffington & Sons, Ltd. 12s. 6d.

Northern Catholicism, Studies in the Oxford Centenary and Parallel Movements. Edited by N. P. Williams, D.D., and Charles Harris, D.D. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

Oxford Apostles, by Geoffrey Faber. Faber & Faber. 15s.

Newman and His Friends, by Henry Tristram. John Lane. The Bodley Head. 6s.

The Necessity for Catholic Reunion, by the Rev. T. Whitton, M.A. Williams & Norgate, Ltd. 5s.

Oxford Movement Centenary Tractates, from the Rev. G. S. Dunbar, 12, Woodstock Road, Bedford Park, W.4. 1s. each.

Epistle from the Romans, by the Rev. E. Messenger, Ph.D. Burns Oates & Washbourne. 6d.

"The Light That Failed," by J. C. Hardwick. Basil Blackwell, Oxford. 1s.

Newman, Education and Ireland, by W. F. Stockley. Sands & Co. 3s. 6d.

Tract Ninety, by A. W. Evans, D.Litt. Constable. 6s.

THE Centenary of the Oxford Movement has been the occasion of a vast amount of writing. Most of this is from Anglican sources and some of it has been criticized as tendentious; but three or four excellent books from Catholic writers and publishers show that we have not been unaware of the significance of the celebration.

Anyone who knows the older literature of the subject has little to learn from these books as far as they concern the original Movement. But if the new publications rendered no other service they would be valuable as reviving an interest in a chapter of Ecclesiastical History which it were shameful for us to neglect, and as focussing Catholic attention on a small but growing development in the Church of England which at first sight seems to be an answer to the many prayers for our country's conversion.

It is an open question whether the Centenary is to be regarded as the commemoration of a Movement which flourished in the first half of the last century and then died, or as the completion of a century of continuous progress which has brought the Church of England nearer to Rome and which has witnessed a growth of numbers and prestige in the Catholic Church in this country, more or less dependent upon the influx of Oxford Movement converts.

Most of the Anglican writers take the second view, but I am not sure that the record does not show a breach of continuity at 1845 or 1850 such that the original leaders would deny their parentage of a development so different from their own in ethos and in objective. Although Pusey and Keble and other distinguished members of the Movement survived the shock of Newman's conversion and the subsequent lesser shock of the Gorham Judgment, which was the occasion of Manning's submission, it seems clear that after 1845 Newman's place was never filled, that the cohesion of the Movement was lost and that its essential principles of authority and traditionalism were at least obscured.

From that time the Bishops began to be openly flouted, and a policy of "persecution" (or prosecution) on their part was met with a spirit of bravado and contempt. This is manifest in the history as recorded by Mr. Morse-Boycott, and indeed it is public knowledge. It has nothing to do with outsiders and a fairly reasonable defence is offered by Mr. Whitton. The principle of authority of the Tractarians did not mean loyalty to the Bishops. But it did include it, at least in the case of their great leader, for whom his Bishop was his Pope, whose lightest word *ex cathedra* was important. Moreover, the observer finds it hard to reconcile this attitude

towards even persecuting Bishops with loyalty to a never so "Catholic" Church of England.

As the High Church movement developed, Liberalism, and ultimately, Modernism, got a strong foothold. This is condemned by the authors of the Centenary Tractates and their group as heartily as it could be by the most ardent Catholic, but it claims descent from the Oxford Movement as definitely as they do. The Editor of *Lux Mundi* was among the most eager seekers after Reunion. But nothing could be more alien from the spirit of the Tractarians. As Mr. Dawson writes :—

The Pope's famous condemnation of the proposition "that the Church can and ought to reconcile itself with Liberalism, Progress and Modern Civilization" is precisely the view of the leaders of the Oxford Movement. . . . This was the main issue of the Movement, and all its measures of ecclesiastical and liturgical reform were subordinated to this central pre-occupation. If Keble or Pusey returned to see the results of their work to-day, they would not judge it by the changes it has produced in ecclesiastical ceremonial. They would not pay great attention to the increase in the use of vestments and incense and the Gregorian chant. They would ask whether there was more supernatural faith in the Church of England to-day than there was a century ago—whether there was a stronger hold on dogma and a more objective view of spiritual truth. And it would not be easy to answer in the affirmative since the success of the Anglo-Catholic Movement in all that concerns the externals of worship has been accompanied by a no less remarkable advance of Liberalism and Modernism in matters of faith. But what would most alarm and scandalize the spirits of Keble and Pusey is that these two tendencies are no longer sharply defined and mutually hostile movements. They co-exist with one another in the very bosom of the Anglo-Catholic party itself (pp. 136, ff.).

Without wishing for a moment, in face of the repeated disclaimers of Mr. Morse-Boycott and the more convincing testimony of Dr. N. P. Williams's attempt to exhibit a theological framework of the Anglican position, to insist that the professed successors of the Oxford leaders are mere ritualists, it cannot but strike the impartial reader of the history of the Anglican revival in the past eighty years that vestments, lights, incense and chant have filled the minds of the rank and file, not indeed to the exclusion of dogma, but sufficiently to allow of a ritualistic bond when a dogmatic agreement

was impossible. And it really will not do for Mr. Morse-Boycott to plead that these things are merely insisted upon as symbols. Anyone who reads the controversy of *The Twenty-One* in his later pages will see that this was the substance of their plea, and will recognize the force of the Bishop of London's answer that "out of the 170 incumbents who have Reservation in this diocese, and who are as strong Anglo-Catholics as you are yourselves, with a few exceptions, you twenty-one are the only ones who have not seen your way to obey this regulation" [forbidding the moving of the Reserved Sacrament from its appointed place, opening the aumbrey, censuring it, etc.] (p. 258).

I repeat that I do not consider that this domestic strife is any concern of ours, and one must have intense sympathy for the many pious and great-hearted men, who, in face of constant opposition, have carried on a fight for what they thought to be Catholic truth and whose chiefest longing seems to be Reunion with Rome.

Anyone anxious for a brief, clear and comprehensive account of the Oxford Movement proper will find it best exposed in Mr. Christopher Dawson's *Spirit of the Oxford Movement*. Mr. Lewis May's beautiful book has it all, but it is longer, and the second section is devoted to the more modern development. Mr. Shane Leslie's witty book has for its sub-title "1833-1933," and there is no detail that eludes his recording pen and appraising judgment. The result is a book whose sparkling wit bubbles over even into the bibliography, but a book full of allusive remarks which may be lost on a reader unfamiliar with the subject.

With his usual flair for historical perspective Mr. Dawson fits the story into its place in the nineteenth century. The Movement "represents that unique moment in the history of our culture when English society had emerged from the stability of the Georgian world and had not yet become set in the mould of Victorianism" (p. 3).

It was the last fruit of the old Anglican tradition that had its roots in the seventeenth century, and at the same time it brought the English tradition out of its spiritual isolation into contact with the main currents of Western culture, with Catholicism and Liberalism.

The Reform Bill of 1829 was the battle between the philosophy of Bentham and the Utilitarians on the one side, backed by the rationalism of Revolutionary France; and, on the other, the English Tory tradition backed by German philosophy and the new spirit of Romanticism. Newman has told us of the influence of Scott's novels on his own boyhood's development; but the novels affected England generally and bred a spirit of affection for the romantic religious background of days that were long dead and forgotten.

The starting point of the Movement was Keble's Assize Sermon on National Apostacy delivered in 1833, an apostacy of which the presage was found in the reform of the Irish Church. This sermon was the clarion call for Newman and Hurrell Froude just back from their Mediterranean tour. Froude had before this done "the one good act of his life" in bringing Keble and Newman to know each other. Others were associated with these, Rose of Cambridge, Marriott, Perceval, Palmer and, later on, Pusey; but at the beginning, at least, the three friends were the mainspring of the Movement. They set about the reform of the Church.

How much that Church stood in need of reform is exhibited at considerable length in a series of quotations in Mr. Morse-Boycott's chapter, "The Valley of Dry Bones."¹ The glaring crime was worldliness, a contempt for the spirit of the gospel and a neglect of the most elementary decencies of public worship. The basis of this corruption was Erastianism. The whole disedifying story is told with becoming brevity by Mr. Shane Leslie (pp. 34 ff.).

A Church such as that described could not hope to be an ark of salvation for the English people, still less to be a bulwark against the advancing waves of Liberalism. It is not surprising that serious thinkers of all shades of opinion should be exercised about its reform. The Bishops had been sternly told to "set their house in order." Arnold, caught by the liberalizing spirit of the day, had in 1832 produced a pamphlet on Church Reform, in which he advocated the union of the various Protestant sects, thus sacrificing

¹ A careful reading of this turgid book, which is full of information especially on the subsequent history, leaves me still in the dark as to the reason of the "Secret" of its title.

the dogmatic principle. He was a great Englishman, and his ideal was a national Church fostering a strictly national religion which should embody all the national virtues. According to Mr. May (in an unusually severe moment), "his God was an English God, the Son not of a carpenter, but of highly respectable parents of the British Middle Class, and He moved against a background of English scenery" (p. 32). "He was, in fact, Arnold himself, with all the Arnoldian virtues carried to infinite perfection."

From that ideal Newman recoiled. It was opposed to his deepest convictions. "From the age of fifteen," he writes, "dogma has been the fundamental principle of my religion: I know no other religion, I cannot enter into the idea of any other sort of religion; religion as a mere sentiment is to me a dream and a mockery."

From Whately, the young Evangelical had learned to look on the Church as a Society, and a Society independent of the State. This Church was the guardian of the sacraments, and was governed by a hierarchy. To his own Bishop he rendered the most unquestioning obedience. "I loved to act as feeling myself in my Bishop's sight, as if it were the sight of God."

These two principles of dogma and a visible Church were accepted by Keble and Froude. They were the principles which the Oxford Movement made its own, and all the doctrinal, devotional and ascetic developments of the Movement were designed in furtherance of these.

The leaders were men of high moral calibre, and Pusey, Keble, Froude and Newman were severely ascetic in their private lives. They desired no aid from the ungodly:

Thou to wax fierce
In the cause of the Lord!
Anger and Zeal
And the joy of the brave,
Who bade thee feel
Sin's slave?

But their asceticism did not diminish the charm of their intercourse with others. Beautiful and intimate friendship is characteristic of the Movement. All its historians insist upon this aspect of it.

But of the recent publications three stand out. In a prose whose dignity and beauty are worthy of the subject Mr. Lewis May gives sympathetic sketches of these men and their friendships, while *Newman and His Friends* is the title of an exquisite little book devoted to Newman's literary Dedications, which has just appeared from the Bodley Head. In the introduction to this book Mr. Lewis May justly remarks the music of Fr. Tristram's prose and "those qualities—too rare in these clamorous, blatant days—of taste and reticence by which it is distinguished." Fr. Tristram, in his Preface, writes: "We hear much of Tractarian friendships; but one characteristic feature of them seems to have been overlooked, how well the Tractarians realized that mutual love must have as its basis mutual reverence."

But Mr. Geoffrey Faber, in his large and otherwise interesting book, strikes a regrettably jarring note. In the beginning he writes:—

We cannot, without risk of self-deception, treat a Newman as if he were a patient in the consulting-room of the psychoanalyst. The psychologist, accustomed to deal with men whose texture is not tough enough to endure long mental conflict, is not yet equipped to handle giants. His net will not hold the big fish (p. 24).

But then, throughout the book, he gives rein to the modern tendency for psychology; he enters into long and displeasing discussions as to the nature of the friendships; he even attempts to analyse one of Newman's dreams without the advantage of the "consulting room" and the possible enlightenment of the patient's free associations. To me, at least, the analysis carries no conviction, nor does the attempt to synthesize the supposed elements of Newman's character. Here is one example:

The submissiveness to authority is one of the clearest features in Newman's character from first to last. Not to *any* authority. The yoke must fit his neck; it must be old and stately; it must be absolute. And, by a seeming paradox, he must choose it out for himself. So his submission satisfied both his humility and his pride. Each step that he takes demonstrates his superiority to the crowd and brings him nearer to the utter self-abasement which his soul desires (p. 56).

These men, such as they were (and the judgment of their contemporaries and of the majority of their successors is kinder than that of Mr. Faber), set about waking up the Church of England to a sense of its responsibilities. "Out of his own head" Newman began the Tracts. These, at the beginning, were short, pithy, unsigned pamphlets designed to arouse interest. During the succeeding months he went about on horse-back to rectories up and down the country delivering them. Presently Pusey came in with a long and carefully thought out tract on Fasting which he initialled. This was the signal for a change of character. The tracts became more formal.

Meantime, a new force made itself felt. Newman began to spread his doctrines from the pulpit of St. Mary's. It is unnecessary at this time to repeat the estimates of those sermons. Mr. May writes:—

Though he that uttered it has long been dead, that voice is echoing still. It cannot die. It is, like Virgil's, or Dante's, one of the deathless, lonely voices of the past, whose music Time cannot mar, nor the years make faint; one of those voices which, soaring serene above the storms of controversy, above the tumult of warring sects, of rival schools, address their message to the suffering heart of all humanity. Great as was the influence of the Tracts, the influence of these sermons was infinitely greater. Here was no expansion of doctrine—the doctrine was implied, taken for granted, not stated—the sound of argument was hushed and, in the solemn stillness of the deepening twilight, while on the rapt countenance of the speaker seemed to glow the radiance of some unrisen day, the entrancing music of that voice of voices fell like dew upon the heart.^a

But, in addition to tracts and sermons, Newman delivered full-dress theological lectures. If he preached grace and judgment and temptation, he must show the source and means of grace—which meant the dogmas of the Incarnation and Redemption, of Church, Sacraments and Merit. Above all, the Church. To save his soul he must belong to the visible Church, and he laboured to prove that as a member of the Church of England he did belong to it. He met the challenge of Rome by appealing to antiquity, to the Fathers. At once he was in the company of the Non-jurors and the great divines of the seventeenth century. To this

^a *The Oxford Movement*, p. 94.

association Mr. Shane Leslie devotes considerable space. Newman adopted the branch theory. England, Rome and the Greek Church were all descended from the Church of the Apostles. But he seeks no alliance with Rome. He condemns her on account of her supposed corruptions. Accused of Romanizing tendencies he indulged in violent diatribes against her, for which "cursing and swearing" Froude rebuked him.

But he had to claim for the Church of England dogmas and a consequent toleration of practice with both of which she was long unfamiliar and which the mass of her adherents repudiated. The large Protestant lump which the Movement was beginning to leaven became articulate and its voice was directed against the reformers. These objectors had to be shown that their own articles were designedly patient of a Catholic interpretation. Hence *Tract XC*. This caused a great stir, and edition after edition was sold out in a few weeks. It brought down on the heads of the Oxford group the full force of the Protestant wrath. It was considered to be a demonstration of their underhand methods of leading an unsuspecting Church of England into the toils of Rome. "I would be sorry to trust the author of that tract with my purse," said one Dr. Close—and that is all that most of us know of him. In deference to the protest of his Bishop, Newman, true to his principle of loyalty, offered to discontinue the Tracts. An attempt was made to have *Tract XC* condemned by Convocation, an effort that was defeated by the non-placet of the Proctors.

This *tour de force* of Newman's which broke the Movement and is the origin of the changed outlook of its modern successors, is probably unknown nowadays except in so far as it is analysed in the *Apologia*. Dr. A. W. Evans has therefore done a service in reproducing the tract with an excellent introductory essay, in a small but beautifully printed volume.

This was the beginning of the end. From 1841 to 1845 Newman, in retreat at Littlemore with his monastic group of friends, was engaged in settling his account with Anglicanism. He wrote the *Development of Christian Doctrine*, and before he had concluded it had made up his mind. He was received on October 9th by the Italian Passionist, Fr. Dominic.

When Newman went the commanding genius was gone, as Pusey and Keble both realized; but after the first effects of the shock were over such leaders as were left rallied themselves and carried on the work. But there was a difference. Even before Newman's control was removed a new spirit had invaded the party, a change of emphasis which had appeared with a group of clever young men, the most conspicuous of whom were Ward and Oakeley. This group "cut into the Movement at an angle, fell across its line of thought, and then set about turning that line in its own direction." They headed towards Rome.

It is along this new line that one section of the Anglican movement has developed. To-day and for years past it has been directed towards Reunion with Rome. The steadily pursued objective has been so to whittle away differences that reunion may become a practical possibility. They lament the rigidity which will concede nothing to their claims. Only the other day there was considerable fuss in certain quarters because the Holy Father was reported to have spoken of a nostalgia for Rome, a heading towards Rome. These words were violently resented by some spokesmen of the Church of England. But whether the Holy Father used these words or not, surely it is true that nothing short of full Roman communion will ever satisfy the advanced Catholicizing section of the Church of England. Their practice shows it; their insistence on the elements of Catholic doctrine shows it; their very impatience of any sign of intransigence shows it; and the recent literature is full of it.

But, in speaking thus about a large and heterogeneous group, one must recognize that not all these things are true of any section of that group. In *The Necessity for Catholic Reunion* there is a conspicuous absence of any sign of impatience, a determination not to be "rattled," while there is supreme interest in the object of Reunion. The author of this admirable book, which quite definitely is a book to read, states the Roman view and the Anglican view, and shows the difficulties which lie in the way of their reconciliation. From the beginning he seizes on the essential note of unity and of union with the Pope as a sign of Catholicity. He recognizes that the attempt to reunite through an agreement with the

Orthodox is hopeless, and adhering to the implication of his chief premiss, the unity of the visible Church, he accuses those who appeal to Constantinople of a *petitio principii*. He would probably agree with Mr. Shane Leslie who writes :

Rome is half-way to Constantinople, not *vice versa*. When you have broken with your canonical wife, it does not mend matters to flirt with your mother-in-law, however venerable. As far as helping the reunion of Christendom it is like building a top story before securing the basement.

Mr. Whitton calls for reunion as an urgent necessity, if England is to be saved for Christianity. Every word of his book tends to support that plea.

There is an increasing number of Anglo-Catholics, especially among the laity, who are convinced that the remedy for our present distress is Reunion with the Holy See and the great majority of Catholics; that this Catholic Reunion is the goal of the Tractarian or Catholic Revival; that Reunion must come before the conversion of England (St. John xvii. 21); that, as long as she is isolated the Church of England, through official representatives, will more and more mislead the people in the fundamentals in faith and morals; that for the sake of the country it is necessary that those who value Catholic faith and morals try to compose their differences and strengthen the "iron bulwark" . . . and that it is our duty to see how far we can go, and to go as far as we possibly can, in order to do this (p. 158, f.).

He is not committed to corporate Reunion as Mr. Spencer Jones would seem to be: "No one method of Reunion, such as corporate Reunion of the whole communion, group Reunion of a party *en masse*, or individual Reunion, is either to be insisted on or ruled out" as a principle of the Reunionist Party which he desires to see set up.

Apparently he would agree with Mr. Spencer Jones, Mr. Morse-Boycott and Mr. Lewis May that the desire for Reunion is the logical outcome of the Tractarian Movement; but he is so deeply concerned with practical politics that he devotes no time to this consideration. He sees that while parties are squabbling the English Church and the advanced Anglican party are disintegrating; that Modernism, Communism and the corruption of morals are steadily advancing. What he does not seem to see is that the formation of still another party,

even though it enjoy the simplicity of a single objective, is going to involve further delays. Will not those who desire corporate Reunion hold back those who are satisfied with mass Reunion? And will not both consider an individual conversion as a defection, a scuttling out of the sinking ship? Will they be able to influence the course of events from their equivocal position within the Anglican Church more effectively than they would from without? Newman went when Keble and Pusey stayed.

Newman went; but Newman remained, a sort of Pentecostal presence. Newman's was the spirit of genius and fire that kept all things in life and motion, that melted the frost of apathy or indifference, that sowed the seeds of life which still continue to bring forth flower and fruit, where before all was static and rigid. . . . It was Newman who remained the real, the great though invisible leader, whose influence increased as the years went on, and is still increasing.³

But Newman, loyal as he was to friends and eager for the saving of the Church, knew well that the primal duty was to his own soul: "Can I be saved in the English Church? Should I be damned were I to die to-night?"

Mr. Whitton sees well the position with regard to Anglican orders. He recognizes that even though there were no infallible ruling the use of them would still be unlawful. Others of his school cling to them. Some try to make a case for them in theology and history. How weak that case is Dr. Messenger has shown in his *Epistle from the Romans*. Others, like Mr. Morse-Boycott, appeal to their experience of the effects of Holy Communion. Without calling in question for a moment the validity of that experience, I would suggest that it can be adequately explained without assuming the Real Presence: the sense of awe, of doing something unusual, of suffering persecution for justice' sake, to say nothing of the likelihood of uncovenanted graces, would account for the mystic glow which as often as not is absent from a Catholic receiving Holy Communion.

There are others who claim that their special type of Anglicanism is the issue of the Oxford Movement. A group of them (how closely united in thought and outlook

³ Lewis May, 169 f.

it is difficult to say) have contributed to the production of a large book edited by Dr. N. P. Williams and Dr. Charles Harris. The general title is *Northern Catholicism*, Northern being equivalent to Non-Papal Western (p. xiv.). "The contributions," we are told,

will be found to be the products of a common mind, the mind of those who believe that the predestined task of the Catholic Revival in the English Church and of similar revivals in other bodies is not to construct a pale and depotentiated reflex of either of the great historic types of Catholicism, Latin or Eastern, but rather to elaborate a third classical presentation of the one Faith, indebted in various ways to both of the older classical presentations, but yet possessing its own characteristic identity and, within due limits, self consciousness.

The most noteworthy essay in the book is that by Dr. N. P. Williams. He calls it *The Theology of the Catholic Revival*, by which he means "the general principles or ideas underlying" that revival. He asserts that

The Catholic Movement never has been, and, please God, never will be a substantive or organized sect within the English Church, an *Ecclesia in Ecclesia*; it is rather a diffused influence or tendency which aims at permeating, and to some extent does permeate, the whole body.

Which is very much what Newman said of the Movement in his day.

Dr. Williams tries to discover "the authority for and criterion of Catholic truth as a whole." He condemns both ritualistic self-consciousness and the tendency to look to Rome as to an authority with inherent claims to obedience. With Mr. Whitton he observes that to seek such infallible authority is necessarily to recognize the need for union with the Papacy. He speaks of "a small minority" which "has attempted to take the wind out of the Roman sails by explicitly accepting, in theory, the whole Roman position—and yet remaining where they were" (p. 141). With them Dr. Williams betrays no sympathy.

He seeks authority in the undivided Church, the Church of the first millennium. After a long investigation in which he discards, as being unnecessary to the concept of the true Church, the Papacy and infallibility, he arrives at a notion of the Church which

represents it as consisting of two concentric circles,

namely, (a) the orthodox nucleus, possessing direct and complete continuity with the Church of the Apostles; and (b) the *penumbra, pomerium*, or fringe of Christianity whose belief or Church life is in one way or other defective (218).

He acknowledges that this broad conception of the Church is not one which was ever expressed by the Fathers, but it is his opinion

that if they had been children of our time, and not of their own, they would not have quarrelled with a terminology designed to cover spiritual facts of which, in their more tolerant moments, they were by no means oblivious;

but then they wouldn't have been Fathers.

He concludes :

We do not accept the Catholic Faith on the authority of the Anglican Communion: we accept it on the authority of Scripture and Christian antiquity, and we choose to belong to the Anglican Communion (rather than to any other organized Christian body) because we are satisfied, on examining its formularies and its practical working, that (with whatever local and individual failures) it offers us the full sacramental life of Catholicism without imposing impossible terms of communion, and holds the full faith of undivided Christendom without dubious and legendary accretions in an open-minded spirit which welcomes all the light that modern knowledge has to throw upon eternal truth (232).

But now see what the authors of the *Oxford Movement Centenary Tractates* have to say to it all. This is a series of pamphlets designed to show the unbroken tradition of allegiance to the Holy See from the earliest times. We are shown the idea of union with Rome in catenas of quotations: the witness of the Celtic Church, the Anglo-Saxon Church, the General Councils, the Church of England, the English Divines, the Tractarians; and the final Tractate asks: *What are we to say?* The general aim is to plead for Reunion as the only way of making amends for the guilt of schism. Visible union with the See of Peter is a necessity.

Schism from the Church or schism within the Church is sin. *Our schism from Rome was Corporate: the remedy must be Corporate.* Individual secession serves but to postpone reunion and leaves the problem where it was before.

If, led by the Holy Spirit of Truth, we attain to dogmatic agreement we may be sure that they [i.e., Catholics] will meet us; that they will bear with us and will not seek

to humiliate us; in their charity they will have regard to many of our likes and predilections and will tolerate differences that are not vital, because they will know that we have come a long journey from afar and have our own customs and our own ways, which are not in all points like to theirs.

The judgment of these men on such a construction as Dr. Williams has effected would seem to be contained in the following words of the Rev. H. J. Fynes-Clinton :

Those who claim continuity for the Church of England are bound to recognize as of its very essence her age-long oneness with the Holy See, not only in origin, but in faith and canonical constitution.

The consolidation of a permanently independent Anglicanism, arrogantly and self-complacently claiming to possess a superior form of Catholicism and to be perhaps in the future the centre of a federation of historic churches standing over against the Roman obedience, seems to be the ideal and aim of a section of modern Anglo-Catholics. This we wholly deprecate and must denounce as disloyal, not only to the Church of God as a whole and to the Divine ideal of Unity, but to the true and historical mind of the Church of England. We have to insist against all insular prejudices carefully fostered by an interested officialdom, that the Church of England has no legitimate existence except as part of the Catholic world and therefore dependent upon the Holy See (p. 12).

But from another quarter comes an account of the Oxford Movement and its *sequelæ* which puts the whole situation in a new light. *The Light that Failed* is an intensely interesting pamphlet which gives the record of the Movement in excellently clear outline, and which metes out judgment of the utmost severity on the "loyal" Anglicans who stayed when Newman left. There is something very robust about Mr. Hardwick's style, and his contribution comes like a gusty North-Wester to dissipate much of the fog that hangs over the story. He is unduly severe on persons whose names are revered. Thus :

True, Keble was left, and Dr. Pusey. But the dainty pious versifier and the pedantic professor were poor substitutes for the genius of Newman and the brilliance of Ward. Mr. Keble could write hymns to be sung by the new surpliced choirs of the Anglican revival, and Dr. Pusey could adapt Roman manuals of devotion for ladies of the rentier class and for undergraduates who enjoyed the lilies and languors of piety. Both men could also utter a series of querulous

protests against the rising tide of Liberalism and unbelief within the English Church. But they could not make anything of the new movement but a revival—that is to say a resurrection of something that had long been dead (p. 11).

Even the renewal of parish life in the Church of England is not to be attributed to these men. The new life was due to a reconciliation managed by Bishop Wilberforce.

The Church and the world were now, fortunately, on the best of terms; and there was no point in gingering up the clergy to fight the Whigs. The Whigs, taking them as a whole, were a very fine set of fellows—business-like, and (when it suited them) generous. Some of them were gentlemen, and the remainder would like to be if they could.

His conclusion is that all those who follow Newman's principles should go to Rome as fast as they can. The Church of England must make up its mind as to what it stands for. If it is for authoritarianism it should at once be absorbed in the Roman Church. "If Anglicanism is only a provincial form of Romanism, it has no *raison d'être*, and should hasten to submit to the Mother Church, where its ideals are held with more assurance and propagated with more effectiveness." One cannot but feel that Mr. Hardwicke speaks for a very large but rather inarticulate body in the Church of England.

In all this welter of opinion is it remarkable if ordinary Catholics find it difficult to cope with the situation, and feel that any talk of Corporate Reunion is merely a loss of valuable time: if they ask, With which of these groups are we expected to reunite, and what does that particular group stand for? if they say We will continue to pray as we have long prayed for the Conversion of England, but we cannot think that this much desired end can best be served by anything which delays individual souls from leaving what is confessedly a city of confusion? Catholics do not reject advances such as those we have been considering. We would not question the sincerity and earnestness of those appeals for a hearing. But we cannot understand how men with these convictions can reconcile themselves to life and death in the Church of England. Newman, in one of his dedications, addressed Hugh Rose as one "who when hearts were failing bade us betake ourselves to our true mother"; and, as he laid down his pen from writing

his *Development of Christian Doctrine*, he warned his readers: Time is short, Eternity is long. *Defunctus adhuc loquitur*.

A final question is raised: How far did the Movement affect the development of the Catholic Church in England? At the beginning of the nineteenth century the Church was despised, hiding from observation, without influence in public life. To-day she is recognized as the one bulwark against infidelity and the immorality which pervades modern life, and against the assembling of the two which goes by the name of Communism. She has her cathedrals, colleges, churches and schools throughout the land. She has a full hierarchy, a numerous and respected priesthood. Is the change due to the Oxford Movement? According to Mr. Shane Leslie, not at all; or very little.

The Oxford Movement stimulated and adorned the Catholic Revival, but as far as that Revival increased and swelled the Roman Church in England it was due to the Irish.

However, the Movement gave to the Church, in days when she was sorely in need of them, cultured writers, preachers, apologists; it gave many religious vocations; it opened an epoch in Catholic public school education.

It is true that there was a Wiseman, and there had been Challoner, Milner, Lingard, Tootel. Ullathorne, primarily an administrator, had written long and important spiritual treatises; but in spite of his "best book on the subject" of humility, he would have been the first to realize his own shortcomings and the advantage to the Church of men who, in Wiseman's phrase, "had learned to teach from St. Augustine, to preach from St. Chrysostom, and to feel from St. Bernard." Ullathorne was in a class of his own: he "who came of the blood of Sir Thomas More had a dignity and power which could dispense with Oxford manners or degrees."⁴ But Manning, Ward, Oakeley, Faber, Dalgairns, Harper, were writers who in their different spheres mattered. And incomparably above them all Newman brought a distinction to Catholic letters which put them in the forefront of English culture. His *Discourses to Mixed Congregations*, *Lectures on Anglican Difficulties*, *Idea of a University*, *Grammar of Assent* commanded the

⁴ Shane Leslie, p. 156.

attention of educated Englishmen; while the *Apologia* resounded throughout the world and placed its author in a unique position as a defender of Catholic truth. In the words of the Clergy of Lancashire: "It was their battle more than your own that you fought. . . . In addition to answering the original accusation you have placed them under a new obligation, by giving to all who read the English language a work which for literary ability and the lucid exposition of many difficult and abstruse points, forms an invaluable contribution to our literature."

The Oratory School set a new standard in Catholic education and inspired the development that has taken place since. The Irish University, whose sad story of misunderstandings and failure Professor Stockley tells in his own characteristic way, achieved at least a beginning of Catholic higher education in Ireland and paved the way for the present National University. And it was surely Newman's influence which, continuing after his death, led to the approved return of Catholics to the ancient universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

It were a thousand pities if a generation of educated Catholics should grow up ignorant of a movement so interesting in itself, so significant for the understanding of the present state of the Church of England, so generous in its contribution to the growth of English Catholic culture. There are many of the clergy, especially in the generation that is passing, ready to bear witness to the debt they owe to it. But it is to be feared that, perhaps owing to the indiscreet zeal of those whose enthusiasm has outlived their youth, perhaps because of the modern impatience with the deliberate dignity and unblushing sincerity of a past age, there is to-day apathy and neglect of what was the delight and pride of our fathers. The perusal of one or other of these present books would give a sketch of the country to be covered, but recourse to the classics of the subject is necessary for a complete appreciation of its treasures. An unusually impudent "blurb" suggests that one of these new works is likely to rank next to Dean Church's *History of the Oxford Movement*. I am sure that the authors would all agree with me that not one of them can come within measurable distance of that classic, unless it be Mr. Lewis May's delightful volume.

THE IMPORTANCE OF JAPAN

BY THE REV. LEO WARD.

I.

THE rise of Japan in sixty years from insignificance to rivalry with the greatest Powers is a fact which merits from Catholics a far greater attention than it has hitherto received. The history of the Far East has already been affected by the Japanese advance, and it is likely to be influenced to a far greater extent during the next fifty years. Modern Japan has a population of some seventy million souls and one which is increasing at the rate of nearly a million a year. This population is highly educated and highly organized. There is probably no country, not even Germany, where education is more universal and systematic. This in itself must add enormously to Japanese influence on the world's future. Add to this a close unity and intense patriotism. There is surely no other race (unless the Chosen People) which could have endured isolation from the rest of mankind over many centuries with a more proud contentment than did the Japanese. Moreover, they are in a strong position economically, in spite of the smallness of the country and the greatness of its population. This strength is due to their traditional habits of simplicity which are a far stronger proof of civilization than anything they have learned from the West. Englishmen hear much these days of the "low standard of living" among Japanese workers. Whatever truth there be in such a generalization, it must be remembered that even the life of a noble family in Japan would appear to an Englishman intolerable. Yet if health and comfort can really be had without chairs, tables, soap, meat, bread, shoes or stone houses, why must these expensive luxuries be imposed from without? The Japanese, for instance, have sat comfortably on their heels for centuries. Their care for personal cleanliness and devotion to hot baths (though without soap) is far greater than that of the English or any other nation. Our needs are simply not their needs. It is

true that the modern movement of Westernization has induced many of the richer town-dwellers to adopt our habits of life. But they are not dependent on them. Very many prefer the older ways. Thus their economic advantages in trade are due *primarily* to their traditional simplicity of life.

Yet Japan is profoundly civilized whether in her ancient or modern dress. She has even managed to adopt much of Western civilization without accepting Western vulgarity. The enormous efforts to impose "Parisian" music-halls or even American films has so far met with very little success. The classical historical drama of Japan draws a far larger attendance of all classes. Indeed, the whole process of Westernization has mainly been an act of self-protection, an effort to preserve the historic independence of Japan. In order to save their own civilization the Japanese must show that they can use instruments of Western power.

The effort at Westernization synchronized with the restoration of the Imperial House to its primitive leadership. The threat of foreign interference induced the Emperor Meiji to order his people to learn Western ways. This was in 1868. Within a few decades the whole of our complex civilization, even to its most intimate problems, became the subject of debate among millions of Japanese schoolboys. More recently another link has been added, since the English language has come to be accepted semi-officially for communication with foreigners, and is imposed as an obligatory subject in all secondary schools. Thus it is not only the machinery of the West, but also its history and present problems which are familiar to the educated Japanese. I have hardly ever looked about me in a tram or train without noticing someone reading an English book. Modern English history is probably better known to the average Japanese than to the average Italian. It is true that to the majority of Japanese the West means England and America, so far as language is concerned. Their attitude to other tongues than ours is hardly caricatured by the true story of a Japanese boy who, on hearing that Catholic missionaries spoke French, enquired: "What sort of English is that?" But, of course, the educated Japanese are familiar with all that is written in Japanese (or English) about the rest of

Europe. Many, especially medical and law students, study German, and a few (too few alas!) read French also. Luckily the French Catholic missionaries speak excellent Japanese. They learn it more readily than we do, and many of them have spent thirty years or more in Japan. It is probable, however, that no language is more difficult to master than Japanese. So that the adoption of English (which is so widely read though seldom well pronounced) is an essential link between East and West.

II.

But the really interesting question in regard to this Westernization is: how much of it has come to stay? Certainly it is impossible that Japan should ever rid herself wholly of its influence. No nation, however strong, can exist in isolation in the modern world. Moreover, the Japanese have before now assimilated great elements of foreign cultures, as in the advent of Buddhism and the revival of Confucianism. In each case the Japanese mastered and assimilated the foreign culture. They were not mastered by it. Will the Western experiment end in the same way? Personally, I hope so. I think it would be a tragedy if Japan became simply another pawn in the game of world policies which have produced the more extreme manifestations of materialist civilization in cities like Moscow and Detroit. If, on the other hand, the civilization of the West were really assimilated by the Japanese they would be obliged to discover its permanent elements and its true source of life, which can be found only in Catholic Christianity. Nor do I think that this is by any means out of the question. Of course, the "Japanese advance" may cease. The country may go under in her fight for economic existence. She may surrender to Birth Control or be defeated by the forces of Communism in China or even at home. But, unless these things happen, she will inevitably go forward to a new age of culture in which she will have to exercise a world-influence comparable to that of the greatest periods of England, France or Spain. And, in order to do this, she must base her civilization on a religion which can hold the allegiance of modern men at home and abroad. The primitive religion of Japan was Shintoism, the worship of national gods and, above all, the worship of ancestors

and of the Emperor. The advent of Buddhism in the sixth century modified the national character, making it comparatively passive and fatalist, if not pacific. But the modern revival of national consciousness has almost destroyed this influence. The effect of modern (purely secularist) education has been to undermine all real belief in Buddhism or in the gods among the younger generation. Sheer materialism, and with it inevitably a strong dose of Marxism, has been almost the only intellectual meat offered to the more educated Japanese youth during the last twenty years. The consequent decay of morals and the danger of revolution have already alarmed the government which has decreed the revival of Shintoism as the national religion. The majority of the nation, out of sheer loyalty and obedience, have proclaimed themselves ardent Shintoists. Such a religious revolution, decreed from above, would be unthinkable in any other country. But for the Japanese the motive of patriotism can achieve anything. The worship of the ancestors, and still more of the Emperor, has returned, and with it a mitigated worship of the old gods.

But Shintoism cannot last. It cannot inspire real faith among the educated, nor will it even be able to form a spiritual link between Japan and her colonies. Least of all will it remedy the state of morals or diminish crime. If morality of any kind is to survive and true loyalty to the State be sanctified and confirmed by religion it can only be by a faith which can inspire real convictions, which are of permanent and universal validity. Only Christianity could do this in the modern age.

III.

What then is the actual position of Christianity in Japan? Is it conceivable that it may yet supply that spiritual need of which the more thoughtful Japanese are so acutely conscious? The history of the first Christian missions, the coming of St. Francis Xavier and the amazing success of his followers, in what is often called the Christian Century (1540-1640), has often been told. So, too, has the record of Christian heroism, recounted by hostile witnesses, during the most terrible of persecutions. Less well known, except to Catholics, is the dramatic sequel in 1862, the "discovery of

the Christians " who had retained the Faith secretly for over two hundred years. Yet the visitor to Nagasaki (or more exactly to Urakami) finds himself to-day in an atmosphere of traditional Catholic piety reminiscent of Ireland or Brittany. The great church at Urakami, probably larger than the London Oratory, is filled three times on Sunday, while some of the neighbouring villages are purely Catholic, with no other place of worship than the Catholic church. Already, in one district of Japan, the blood of martyrs has proved to be the seed of the Church.

Yet it must be admitted that the nation as a whole has not yet been deeply influenced by this Catholic colony. Perhaps the name of Nagasaki is the most famous of all Japanese names in the Christian world. But the " great world " of Japan is centred in the vast metropolis of Tokyo and in the former " western capital " Kyoto, the historic seat of Japanese culture. How then is Christianity regarded by this " great world " of national influences?

It must be confessed that it is chiefly known in its Protestant presentation. The heroic labours of the French missionaries, who returned to Japan even before the restoration of religious freedom, were at first largely occupied in providing for the spiritual needs of the Nagasaki district. The creation of modern Japan, the great educational work of Westernization, was largely that of English and American Protestants. The great American missionary, Dr. Hepburn, introduced modern surgery and actually invented the Roman spelling of Japanese in which almost every foreign letter to Japan is now addressed. The vast work of national education has been largely based on the model of the Protestant schools. These schools, belonging to various religious bodies, are to be found in every town of any size or importance, although, of course, they are now outnumbered by those of the Government. The study of Western civilization was largely directed by the evangelical missionaries, and the teaching of history even in Government schools shows deep traces of Protestant influence. There are, indeed, a few Catholic schools of unrivalled prestige. But they are insignificant in number and influence compared with those of the Protestant bodies. There is also one Catholic University in Tokyo.

The Protestant bodies have eight universities or "Higher Schools" for men and two for women. Indeed, the Japanese Empire is almost the only missionary country where Catholics form a minority of the Christian people. Yet even in Japan (when we remember Nagasaki), the majority of "practising" Christians are probably Catholic. Moreover, the work of the Protestants has probably done far more good than harm from a Catholic point of view. Very few prejudices against the Church are to be found among Japanese Protestants, and the Protestant missionaries have imparted to many a knowledge of Christ which has proved a valuable preparation to their subsequent conversion to Catholicism. Catholic schools are few and far between. Every town, and many a village too, contains at least one Protestant chapel. A large element in this Protestant success is attributable to the fact that every Japanese of any education is anxious to study English, as the one foreign language which "counts." The Protestant churches provide an invaluable means of doing this. One cynical youth observed to me that if a Japanese student wishes to make friends with a missionary it is only because he wants to practise his English! Indeed, I find that even my own abysmal ignorance is overlooked and I am invited to lecture weekly to a society of Pagan undergraduates on any subject I like. One boy observed: "We want to hear English English." I suddenly realized the advantage of being the only English priest in Japan.

But among Protestants and educated Buddhists the future of Catholicism in Japan is often debated. One clergyman said to me: "My own theology is Protestant. But I recognize that Japan could never be Protestant. The whole future of Protestantism is extremely doubtful owing to its internal contradictions. If Japan is ever Christian she will be Catholic." He then suggested that he might help the Catholic cause by translating Catholic books into Japanese. He argued further that the Japanese act together, as a nation. They have made a corporate effort to provide a new religion, and it has failed. "If they ever try Christianity it will be Catholic Christianity." Moreover, if Japan were Catholic she would herself become a missionary power of unrivalled influence throughout Asia. May this yet be the case? There are certainly grave difficulties. My friend did not

believe that the anti-Christian sentiments of extremists would be a permanent obstacle. But all such opinions, though expressed by serious men, are normally qualified by the remark: "Catholicism is too little known in modern Japan: why have you so few churches, priests and schools? Can it be possible that you are the only English priest here? Are there no Irish, as in China, etc.?"

These questions are difficult to answer. They provoke dreams of English or Irish help by means of prayer and action, men and books. In Japan, as in most missionary countries, the foundations of the Church have been laid by Frenchmen. Probably no other nation could have laid them deeper. And in more recent years the Germans, Canadians, Spaniards, Poles and others have brought splendid help. But all this is very far from being enough if we are to provide for the Christian future of this great country. The other day I visited Kyoto, the Rome of Japanese Buddhism, a city as beautiful as any in the East, and likely some day to be as famous as any in the West. It contains eight hundred temples, an Imperial University as well as a Protestant university and magnificent Protestant schools for five thousand pupils. It has a population of a million. There is one small Catholic Church and a prospective Catholic chapel both due to the zeal of two devoted French missionaries. I could not help dreaming of a Catholic school conducted by English religious and a church where the glories of Catholic ritual would even surpass the æsthetic charm of the old Buddhist temples. The Japanese have not lost their affection for England. They study the language more than ever. But they are quite unaware of the great Catholic revival in our country. Could not its influence be extended to the Farthest East? Some day Japan (and perhaps all Asia) would be duly grateful.

THE LEGION OF MARY IN ACTION

BY THE REV. J. B. BAGSHAWE.

I HAVE recently returned from a visit to Dublin, during which I had every facility for examining the methods and organization of the Legion of Mary in the city of its birth, and I must frankly admit that I was astonished at its strength, efficiency and thoroughness.

Since its foundation by Frank Duff in 1921, the Legion has spread with incredible rapidity, and at the present time there are more than 2,600 Legionaries in Dublin alone, divided into no less than 100 Praesidia. In the following article I propose to describe some of their more striking enterprises and the methods they employ, and leave the reader to judge of their value.

It is unnecessary for me to dwell upon the aims and organization of the Legion, as these have already been described in an admirable article by Father Leonard, C.P.¹ It is sufficient to say now that the Legion does not aim at being a Sodality only, nor yet a Society for Social Service, but it seeks to combine all that is best in both. Its ultimate aim is Catholic Action at its best, but its first concern is the sanctification of its own members. Mindful of the axiom "*Nemo dat quod non habet*," the Legion realizes the futility of attempting to render spiritual aid to the world unless its members are themselves imbued with the spirit of Christ and His Holy Mother, and the characteristically devotional atmosphere of its business meetings is designed to produce this effect. It is in the spirit of Apostles rather than of Social Reformers that the Legionaries are urged to apply themselves to their appointed tasks, and I am sure, from what I have observed, that it is this spirit which enables them to undertake with equal courage and enthusiasm the most repulsive and menial tasks, and enterprises calling for real heroism.

Probably few tasks are more arduous and disappointing

¹ "The Legion of Mary," by Father Leonard, C.P., CLERGY REVIEW, November, 1932, page 180.

than the rescue of the professional prostitute. In most cases, habitual vice and drinking have combined to deaden her conscience and sense of shame, and in consequence it is a rare thing to find one who, of her own volition, will seek admission to a Magdalen Asylum, or have the courage to abandon her life and make a fresh start unaided. The Legion of Mary determined to attack this problem, and in July, 1922, the "Sancta Maria" Hostel was opened in Harcourt Street to form the centre for its campaign. From here was organized systematic picketing of the streets, and regular visitation of brothels, Lock Hospitals and common lodging houses, and by such means literally hundreds of girls have been rescued as brands from the burning, and brought to the Hostel. The first step in the process of reformation is usually an enclosed retreat (frequently a religious experience the girls have never had before), and, in the majority of cases, the spiritual effect can only be described as miraculous. They are then subjected to a certain formation process in the Hostel, designed chiefly to teach them to use their liberty properly, and at the same time to infuse into their lives a little innocent happiness which many of them have not enjoyed since their childhood. The rules of the house are proportioned to the weakness of the subjects; smoking is permitted within reasonable limits, and the girls are allowed out during the daytime under supervision, and even alone, if considered trustworthy. Attendance at daily Mass is encouraged, but not enforced. Needless to say, a certain number of failures are recorded, for girls are not confined against their wills, but when they leave, the Legion never loses sight of them, and in many cases the girls voluntarily return after an interval, and frequently the relapse is not repeated. I have had an opportunity of examining the records of the Hostel and the following summary of the results obtained during the past eleven years makes astonishing reading. Out of the 324 girls who have passed through the Hostel, 106 were immediate successes and 123 were successfully rescued after one or more relapses; 95 only being regarded as failures up to the present time, although in no case has hope been abandoned. In addition, 156 girls were dealt with by Legionaries outside the Hostel, of whom only 33 have so far proved failures. Of the successes obtained, 73 girls were placed in Magdalen Asylums, 63 were happily

married (usually to a former partner in sin), and 30 made happy deaths, fortified by the Rites of the Church through the Legion's instrumentality. Truly a remarkable achievement!

In another part of Dublin, Rescue Work of a different character is being undertaken, but with equal success. In the vast wilderness of buildings which formerly were known as the North Dublin Union, two great hostels have been opened for human derelicts, the "Morning Star" Hostel for men and the "Regina Coeli" Hostel for women. The former has accommodation for 200, and is conducted by an amazingly enthusiastic body of young men, eight of whom live permanently in the building, the rest taking it in turn to work at the Hostel, from the time their office hours have finished until late at night, at any odd job that may need doing, from painting and scrubbing to cleansing verminous garments. Admission into the Hostel is only granted when the candidate has proved that he is utterly down and out; temporary unemployment is not in itself a sufficient qualification. The man must not only be without any visible means of support, but he must be of the type that is rapidly drifting into the ranks of the unemployable, if not already in them. Human driftwood, jail-birds and drunkards, hopeless cases; of such is the "Morning Star" Hostel. With such unpromising material the Legionaries commence their uphill task of regeneration, and one might naturally ask by what system they hope for success. The immediate purpose of the Hostel is to restore in some measure the self-respect which the men have lost, and consequently every effort is made to remove any impression of "charity" or "patronage." Once in the Hostel, the man is given an absolute right to be there, and he need only leave of his own free will, or when he is capable of looking after himself. The direst punishment which could be inflicted is temporary exclusion from the Hostel, never for more than a month, and then only for the gravest offences.

On entering the Hostel, one is at once struck by the quiet orderliness of the crowded rooms. Some are playing billiards or table tennis, others playing chess or draughts or reading, others chatting and smoking. In another room, a group of men are practising the "Adeste Fideles" in something approximating to harmony, while

in the Oratory will be found several men quietly saying their Rosary. And yet this is all achieved without any vestige of supervision; such Legionaries as are found in the public rooms mix freely with the men on terms of equality, joining in their games or chatting with them as friends, not as detectives. The explanation of this spontaneous discipline is a simple one. The men are charged a nominal sixpence for their supper, bed and breakfast, and in consequence they expect value for their money, just as if they were staying in an expensive hotel. They respect the Hostel property and demand that others shall respect it too, since they have paid good money in order to use it, and regard it as their own while they are there. Needless to say, trouble has arisen from time to time, and awkward situations have had to be faced, but as time went on such incidents have become less frequent, until at the present day a definite code of honour has been established by the men, and any infringement is usually dealt with effectively by the men themselves.

It may be asked how men who are destitute can pay sixpence for their night's lodging. The answer is found in the very liberal credit which is granted. During the daytime the men go out in search of work, and when they return in the evening, if they cannot produce their sixpence, a debt for that amount is entered against them, which they are expected to repay at the rate of a penny a day when circumstances permit. Those who wish are given the option of putting in an hour or two in the yard, chopping up firewood, and they are duly paid by results, but there is no compulsory work. Even the men's beds are made and the floors scrubbed by Legionaries; the men are guests in a hostel, not inmates of a workhouse; and it may be noted in passing that their beds are real beds, with comfortable mattresses, blankets and clean sheets and pillowcases. Each man is provided regularly with a clean towel, night shirt and ration of soap, and facilities are provided for bathing and washing linen. When the men first enter the Hostel, they are provided with a hot bath, their clothing is cleansed and, if necessary, replaced, and everything is done to give them a new outlook on life.

Loans of money are freely given to men who have

been in the Hostel for some considerable time, an application for the means to procure a new suit of clothes being welcomed as evidence that the applicant's self-respect is being re-awakened, and that he is beginning to take a pride in his personal appearance—a sure sign of returning morale. Similarly, applications for help in obtaining tools or a small stock-in-trade are gladly accepted as proof that the man's residence in the Hostel has at last produced the desired effect. From this it must not be assumed that loans are granted indiscriminately. On the contrary, each application is given most careful consideration, the man's character and conduct in the Hostel being duly taken into account, but when the members of the Praesidium have decided to place their confidence in a man, it is rarely that their confidence is betrayed. In nearly every case the debts are honourably repaid, even though it may be years before a man can save up sufficient money for the purpose. Indeed, it is one of the most heartening features of the work that the men who have been placed on their feet again through the instrumentality of the Hostel, not only remember the debt they owe, but not infrequently send donations when their circumstances permit.

The length of time spent by the men in the Hostel naturally varies considerably according to the depths to which the men have sunk. In most cases, the process of degeneration has been a gradual one, extending over many years, and consequently it may take years to restore a man to his normal condition. The Legionaries face this fact with equanimity, and will be perfectly satisfied if they observe some improvement at the end of a year or even more. They never attempt to hasten a man's resurrection; on the contrary, the basic principle of their system is to help a man to help himself, and to re-discover his own initiative and self-reliance. For this same reason the Legionaries do not attempt to find work for the men, except in very special cases. They realize that it might be possible to force some of their men into jobs by the exercise of influence or by "pulling strings," but this they regard as unjust, not only to unwilling employers, but especially to better men who are genuinely out of work, and who have a better right to such jobs as are available. The most they will do is to speak for a man in search of work when called

upon to do so, basing their report upon their own observations.

Adjoining the "Morning Star" is the "Regina Coeli" Hostel for about 200 women, which is run on very similar lines to the men's Hostel, except that its inmates vary far more in character. Here will be found broken-down, battered old women, many of whom are half-witted or drunkards, apparently hopeless cases for the most part; young unmarried mothers and their babies, who cannot be provided for elsewhere; decent young girls from the country who have become stranded and destitute in the city; discharged women prisoners; in fact, representatives of every class of women, reduced to the common level of destitution and despair, with the sole exception of the professional street-walker who is passed on at once to Harcourt Street.

The system followed is very similar to that employed at the "Morning Star," and all but the unmarried mothers go out during the day in search of employment. A row of cottages at the rear of the Hostel have been re-arranged, and here the young mothers spend the daytime with their babies, running the establishment between them on "Soviet" lines, without any supervision. A trustworthy girl is allowed to go out to work if she wishes to do so, and in that case she makes her own arrangements for her baby to be "minded" by one of the other girls during her absence, and it rarely happens that a girl absconds in an attempt to abandon her baby.

In the evenings all gather together in the enormous rooms of the main building, and after supper, Legionaries assist in their entertainment or instruction. On the evening when I visited the "Regina Coeli," some were dancing to the piano, while others were showing intense interest in a practical demonstration of cutting out and making baby clothes, conducted by several members of the Legion. Elsewhere, an apologetics class was in progress, while the Oratory was by no means deserted. A large room is reserved as a Concert Hall, and each Hostel runs its own "Dramatic Society."

Associated with these Hostels is a free clinic and dispensary, attended regularly by some of the best medical men in Dublin, surgeons, physicians, dentists, oculists, dispensers, etc., all of whom render their

services gratuitously. This is the Legion's reply to the similar institutions conducted by proselytizing agencies, which are regularly picketed by Legionaries whenever they open their doors, and with such success that one such establishment has recently been closed owing to lack of support. In like manner, proselytizing free meal centres are picketed, and the misguided poor who frequent them are directed to Convents and other Catholic centres where better meals can be obtained.

I have said nothing of the other normal activities of the Legion, such as the visitation of hospitals, prisons and lodging houses, nor of parochial activities, such as census-making, instruction of children and the running of clubs and guilds, as these have already been enumerated by Father Leonard, C.P., in the article referred to above. I have confined myself simply to the more outstanding activities of the Legion to be found in Dublin, which I regard as the outward manifestation of the virile, militant Faith which dominates it.

Speaking for myself, I found the example of these young men and women a stimulus and an inspiration, and while I fully realized that we, in London, find different problems and difficulties from those in Dublin, and in consequence may have to apply different methods for their solution, I was none the less forced to the conviction that we have much to learn from their experience and splendid example, and if God gives us men and women animated with the same spirit of Faith and Hope and Love, then no problem of ours will prove insoluble.

EDUCATION AND CATHOLICS

BY THE REV. ANDREW BECK, A.A.

THE spirit of Christ and the spirit of the world have been in opposition since the very foundation of the Church. The battle has always been joined, though from age to age the scene of action may have shifted and the struggle may have grown or decreased in intensity. The history of the Church is largely the story of the various phases in this struggle, with the Church occasionally but rarely victorious, more often apparently defeated, but always recovering and never entirely put to rout. As her members are but human, human weakness and failure in moments of crisis have been against her also; and it is significant that the first two betrayals of Christ were motivated by these two ever-present failings in man, love of riches and the fear of what others should think—human respect. Judas and St. Peter stand as types; and their weakness should also serve as warning.

In this country we are concerned, among other things, with the question of our schools. On the main issue, our principles are clear and our action concerted; but there are several occasions for the practical application of these principles where there seems to be less agreement among Catholics; and even possibly the beginnings of opposition. It is the object of this paper to touch on some of these points.

First, and perhaps of greatest importance, it must be stressed that the "schools question" does not concern only the elementary schools. Because this class of school has been prominent in dispute and compromise with the Government, because it is in the category most regimented by the controllers of the nation's education, and because numerically it is the largest class, the attitude of mind has developed that when Catholics talk about their schools they refer only to their elementary schools. This is, of course, wrong. There are at least two other classes of school to which Catholics must give

their attention. Sir John Gilbert pointed out last year that Catholic secondary schools, especially those recognized by the Board of Education, need also the support and assistance of Catholics. These secondary schools are for both boys and girls, with the convent schools in a fairly large majority. There is also a group of schools which, though perhaps numerically small, should produce—in the Catholic sense—the *élite* of our Catholic laity. These schools are somewhat loosely called the Catholic “public schools.” The term implies that they are boys’ schools, though probably many of the more expensive convent schools could be assimilated to them for the purpose of this discussion. They may be considered as the schools to which the majority of Catholics of the upper classes send their children.

A second point concerns the aim of Catholic education. St. Paul expressed the ideal most vividly: “Filioli mei quos iterum parturio donec formetur Christus in vobis”¹ The Holy Father, in his Encyclical on Christian Education of Youth, insists repeatedly on the same idea: “It is therefore as important to make no mistake in education as it is to make no mistake in the pursuit of the last end, with which the whole work of education is intimately and necessarily connected. In fact . . . there can be no ideally perfect education which is not Christian education.”²

“The proper and immediate end of Christian education is to co-operate with divine grace in forming the true and perfect Christian, that is, to form Christ Himself in those regenerated by Baptism, according to the emphatic expression of the Apostle. . . .”³

“Hence the true Christian, product of Christian education, is the supernatural man who thinks, judges and acts constantly and consistently in accordance with right reason illuminated by the supernatural light of the example and teaching of Christ; in other words, to use the current term, the true and finished man of character. For, it is not every kind of consistency and firmness of conduct based on subjective principles that makes true

¹ Gal. iv. 19.

² *C.T.S. Translation*, p. 3.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

character, but only constancy in following the eternal principles of justice. . . ."⁴

In his Lenten Pastoral for this year, Cardinal Bourne came back to the same subject and went directly to the heart of the matter. "They [our Catholic schools] have many subjects to teach; but if they fail in giving to their pupils a true knowledge and a personal love of Jesus Christ, Our Lord, then do they fail in their essential purpose. It is very easy to forget this in the stress and strain of educational effort; to allow what is paramount to be obscured by the things which, however necessary, are still only of much inferior importance. We would, therefore, earnestly implore all those who are engaged in teaching to examine themselves very closely at this time as to their attitude in this matter. Do they give to the teaching of the knowledge and love of Jesus Christ the first place in their thoughts and in their efforts."⁵

It is well to remember, then, that the primary work of Catholic schools is *not* to obtain a certain percentage of passes or credits in a public examination, nor to make boys or girls into good clerks, lawyers, doctors, chemists, artisans or typists. These things should be aimed at by Catholic schools, of course, but they are not primarily the reason for the existence of these schools. The formation of the Christian life in the souls of the young is their essential work irrespective of class, condition and environment.

It seems important to emphasize this point particularly with regard to secondary schools. In this sphere of education, Catholics have to contend with an attitude of mind and a body of educational doctrine already in possession. It seems to have been taken for granted that the non-Catholic educational system developed during the nineteenth century was necessarily right and good, and that the addition of a Catholic Religious Knowledge class to the curriculum was all that was needed to make the system completely suitable for a Catholic school. The temptation has been, and still is, to imitate both the ideals and the methods of headmasters such as Arnold, Tring and Bradley, who may have been good educationists in many respects, but were

⁴ pp. 45-46.

⁵ Reprinted in *The Tablet*, March 4th, 1933, p. 263.

certainly not Catholic educationists, and, in the Papal sense, were not even Christian educationists. The great public schools years ago set a fashion which has been permeating downwards (one usually says "downwards"—by courtesy) through the various classes of schools. Almost inevitably Catholic teachers, even priests, take for granted in education, usually by tacit acceptance, ideals and aims which, on analysis, are scarcely those put forward by the Pope. Often enough this means two contrary tendencies in a school—the Catholic and the "accepted" or "academic"—and, unfortunately, it would seem that when there is direct opposition between these tendencies it is the Catholic which, in a large number of cases, is obliged to yield.

In face of the Christian ideal, it is well to ask what is the "academic" ideal in England to-day outside the Church. Anybody who has read the essays on *Public School Religion*, edited by Mr. Arnold Lunn,⁶ cannot but be appalled by the utter absence of even a fair notion of the supernatural in religion in the vast majority of English schools to-day. The present generation of boys and girls is being brought up pagan on a religion of sentiment and "good form." The ideals of the leading non-Catholic educationists may be summed up as "intellectual attainments" and "citizenship"; and though the latter word may be kept more before the public, it seems that professionally the former ideal has the greater force. Schools continue to judge themselves by the criterion of their examination successes.

Intellectual attainment should, of course, be the object of all schools, or at least one of their objects. But it is neither sign nor test of educational success. It considers one part of man only and neglects almost completely the other. The intellect is trained and developed; to a great extent the will is ignored. Modern historians of education and of philosophical ideas have levelled against Thomist philosophy the accusation that it neglected the will in man; and that if Scotism had had a wider following in the later Middle Ages a better type of educational training might have developed. Whether the criticism be true or not so far as the Middle Ages are concerned, it may certainly be made against modern

⁶ Faber & Faber, 7s. 6d.

educational methods. The tendency of all systems is to give more and more play to individual choice, and even caprice, on the part of the pupil. Authority and discipline must be veiled apparently before they can be of service. The child must be coaxed into desiring to do what the teacher hopes it will achieve. The practical effect of such ideas seems to be groups of interesting experiments in child psychology, a flood of literature dealing with education, and apparently the development of a not very pleasant type of assertive self-centred child. The attack of the whole system is on Authority and on the consequent education of the will. It is true that many of the bad effects are counteracted in other ways, particularly with older boys and girls, by imposing on their young shoulders responsibilities in the corporate life of the school, which are supposed to develop self-control, self-dependence and the sense of initiative. This they do to an extent; the prefect system, for example, under proper control, is an excellent character builder. But they all deal with outward manifestations of the pupils' activity, and do not directly touch the central questions of the will's control over the lower faculties and of the will's subjection to authority.

It might be argued that the training of the will is carried out largely outside the classroom by personal contacts, exhortations and examples. Dr. Alington has summed up the "English public school" attitude as follows: "What we in the public schools aim at producing is a type of man who can be trusted to pull his weight at any job that he is given, who has learnt not to consider his own interests as so important as those of the institution he serves, who believes, rightly or wrongly, that there are some great and solid virtues which his country (or, if you like, his school) possesses and is anxious that its reputation should not suffer in his keeping." These sentiments are very noble at first sight; yet they are very closely allied to the expressions which occur so frequently in the reports and minutes of Education Committees on the necessity of inculcating a true spirit of "citizenship" in all children at school. Modern State-worship is largely at the bottom of all this teaching. Much is taught that is good, and should be used by Catholic schools; but in most cases there is at least implicit denial of the true basis of Authority in the

State, and the reason for the possession and exercise of individual rights.

For such fundamental reasons as this, even apart from the question of religious teaching, it is obviously necessary that the Catholic child should be taught in a Catholic atmosphere. There is no true education outside the Catholic school. In theory this is not denied by any serious Catholic; but in practice it would seem that in a vast number of cases expediency governs conduct.

To descend to concrete and practical details, several questions may be asked.

1. Would it not be a help to a better understanding of our resources and equipment if all our schools published the number of non-Catholics on their rolls? Perhaps this could be done by the Diocesan Inspectors, who might easily compile fairly accurate statistics. Many convent schools contain a large number of non-Catholics, and outsiders feel that in some cases this number is a majority, and too big a majority. The whole question of the policy to be adopted by Catholic schools towards non-Catholic pupils is, of course, open to discussion. Many grant-aided schools are not in a position to help themselves in the matter. The broadening of non-Catholic minds, the removal of ignorance and prejudice, and the fostering of conversions are undoubtedly advantages which follow the policy of non-exclusion. But, on the other hand, a big leavening of non-Catholics in a school must inevitably lead to a lessening of the truly Catholic atmosphere. It is hard to think that a Catholic convent with a majority of non-Catholic girls can successfully be imparting a truly Catholic education to its pupils. One feels that the desire for numbers and considerations of finance have perhaps induced school authorities to overstep the bounds of prudence.

2. Why are so many boys of the upper classes sent to non-Catholic preparatory and public schools? Figures in all cases are hard to obtain, but the following, if anything, err on the side of under-statement. Last year there were twenty-six Catholic boys at Wellington, thirteen at Charterhouse, more at Harrow and Eton, and various numbers varying between two and twenty-five

at other schools. In fact, it would seem that there are enough Catholic boys of this class to fill another Catholic school. It may be supposed that in the majority of these cases the boys are children of mixed marriages; but how many parents of these boys have ecclesiastical permission for the step they have taken? Are they made to realize the terrible risks to which they subject their children?

3. Is it good policy that Catholic schools—when they have the choice—should give scholarships to boys or girls educated at non-Catholic schools? The Catholic "public" schools do this, and advertise the fact. It would seem that such an attitude is an excuse, or even an incentive, to parents of a certain type to send their children to non-Catholic schools and prep-schools. It is usually admitted that the purely intellectual standards at non-Catholic schools are higher—and naturally—than at Catholic schools; and if scholarships depend on examination, then a premium is being set on non-Catholic education—and temptation is offered to parents to make use of what may prove a very big saving in expenditure. This policy could quite easily be stopped by the Catholic schools themselves; at least it should not be condoned by them. One cannot but have the suspicion that zeal to have a good scholar leads school authorities in such cases to decisions which are certainly not biassed in favour of the boy who has come from Catholic surroundings.

A further reflection on this is that an even greater number of Catholic boys than is usually suspected must be receiving their early education in the non-Catholic and pagan surroundings of religionless preparatory schools. Should such a movement be stopped? Can it? And does not the first effort to stop it lie with the parochial clergy who are in contact with parents in such cases?

4. Must Catholics follow the non-Catholic tradition and judge schools by their intellectual attainments and examination successes? Absolutely, the failures of Catholic schools are the boys and girls who cease to practise their religion. A writer in the Catholic Press once suggested that schools should publish statistics of such defaulters. Why not? "Of the twelve candidates for Higher Certificate in 1925, three have given up prac-

tising, one has become a novice in a religious Order, and the others are practising Catholic laymen." Why don't parents ask questions requiring an answer of this kind when they are selecting schools?

5. Why does one sometimes get the impression that specifically Catholic studies are in the nature of "extras" in a school's programme? The Conference of Catholic Colleges is doing a very big and important work in drawing up a syllabus of religious instruction suitable for secondary and public schools, and the good effect of this has already been felt. But in most cases attempts at any other Catholic studies have to be restricted to occasional "periods" in the programme or become out-of-school activities. For example, the Catholic Social Guild has a programme of studies arranged for the higher forms of secondary schools. Yet the number of entries for the annual examination is about two hundred.

The trouble is, of course, much deeper than can be remedied by any patching up. The educational disaster of the Reformation was severance from Catholic tradition and even from contemporary thought on the Continent. These countries which have preserved that tradition, even in a dilapidated form, have still made some systematic grounding in philosophy the main feature in their education. The philosophy may be false, but the ideal has been maintained, and it produces a cultural foundation on which to build. England's post-Reformation isolation has divorced her educationists from any such programme. So much so that to Catholics a boy or a girl who reads even elementary philosophy is a bit of an oddity, and the joys (or horrors) of a systematic course seem to be reserved almost exclusively for Ecclesiastical students. Teaching Orders of nuns have realized already that this is wrong, and the Catholic Institute of Higher Studies is making some amends.⁷ Why should not every Catholic secondary school aim in the same direction? A course of Catholic ethics should be included in every Catholic secondary school curriculum.

The cultural background of our modern society is utilitarian and hedonist. It can be changed only by a

⁷ Cf. Dr. Arendzen's article in *CLERGY REVIEW*, April, 1933, p. 298.

vigorous overthrowing and rebuilding. It looks as though we can leave the overthrowing to the forces which are at work in the world. But when the rebuilding time comes we must be ready to re-build, and unless we prepare now, when that time comes we shall not be ready. As Fr. Martindale says, we are allowing the situation to go by default. And that is a very damning indictment.

HOMILETICS

BY THE REV. ERNEST GRAF, O.S.B.

Sunday Within the Octave of the Epiphany.

Feast of the Holy Family.

The Catholic Church is ever a realist. She knows that men and women are much sooner moved by what they can see or touch than by abstract moralizings. Thus, instead of merely exhorting us to be humble, meek, compassionate, she directs our eyes to the Sacred Heart of Him who bade us learn from Him, because He, too, is meek and lowly of heart. Instead of, or at least in addition to, exhortations to purity of life, she puts before youths and maidens the concrete examples of St. Aloysius or St. Agnes. Better than any moralizing theorist she knows the vital importance of a sound family life. She understands full well the perils to which the family is exposed in these days, as well as its inherent difficulties and essential dignity. For that reason she directs our gaze, and that of the world, to the unique household which we familiarly call: The Holy Family of Nazareth.

Strictly speaking, the Holy Family is not a real family. Though in that most blessed household, which once graced an Eastern village, Joseph acts, and is acknowledged as head of the family, he yet is no more than the earthly shadow of the heavenly Father. The child whose presence transfigures the lowly abode of Joseph and Mary has no father on earth. He is fatherless here even as He is motherless in that world to which He properly belongs. But for all His divine independence, Jesus wished *in all things to be made like unto his brethren*.¹ Hence he behaved as a dutiful son, to such an extent that the longest portion of His precious existence in this world is summed up in the concluding phrase of to-day's gospel: *he went down with them and came to Nazareth, and was subject to them.*

The family is the most vital cell in the social organism; the bedrock of all civilization; the perennial source of a nation's health and wealth; the well-spring of a man's purest and most abiding joys. Superficially considered it would seem to be no more than a natural partnership founded upon, and springing from, the mutual attraction of man and woman. As a matter of fact, God is its originator.

In the springtime of human history, when man was still as God had made him, perfect in mind and body, his soul lit up by the splendours of divine grace, God said: *It is not good for*

¹ Heb. ii. 17.

man to be alone. In a still and sacred hour, whilst deep slumber held the senses of Adam, God fashioned for him a worthy companion, one who was not only like unto him, but whose very body had been moulded from his living substance. In a rapture of love and prompted by a prophetic instinct, Adam realized the significance of that which God had done for him: *A man shall leave father and mother and shall cleave to his wife: and they shall be two in one flesh.*²

The supreme beauty and perfection of this divinely ordained society or companionship of man and woman is in the blessing of parenthood. It is the supreme dignity of marriage that a human father and mother are made the sharers in God's creative power. They are the co-operators of God: *Increase and multiply and fill the earth*, God said in the beginning. In virtue of this law He Himself intervenes whenever a human being is born into the world: parents are the authors of the body of their child; the immortal soul is directly called into existence by a personal act of God. Only He who, in the beginning, bade light spring from darkness, can kindle the light that shines so brightly in the house of clay whose building up, precisely because it is but clay, is not beyond the power of nature.

Small wonder that the family should be so sacred and noble an institution. If men would value it properly they should view it always with the eyes of faith. Then they will behold around it a halo of heavenly beauty. The human family is an earthly image—an inadequate, shadowy and tenuous one—of the life of God Himself. God's life is not the isolated, lonely, solitary existence of one Person; on the contrary, His life is a life shared by Three, differing in personal characteristics yet only one God. The Father does not precede the Son in duration, though He begets Him; the Holy Ghost is not inferior to either for He is the everlasting jubilee and ecstatic love wherewith Father and Son delight in each other.

The human family is a faint shadow of this adorable family life of the Godhead. Hence there must be order and precedence, authority and subordination. The father, or husband, is the head of the family: *the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the Church*;³ but if the wife is bound to obey her husband, he on his part must respect and cherish her: *husbands, love your wives, as Christ also loved the Church, and delivered Himself up for it.*⁴ As for the children, to them the Apostle says: *children, obey your parents in the Lord, for this is just: it being the joint duty of both parents to rear their children in the discipline and correction of the Lord.*⁵

There is no separation between the Father, the Son and the

² Gen. ii. 24.

³ Eph. v. 23.

⁴ Eph. v. 25.

⁵ Eph. vi. 1, 4.

Holy Ghost : *My Father hath not left Me alone*,⁶ says Our Lord, and whenever charity is poured out in a soul by the Holy Spirit, there the whole Blessed Trinity takes up its abode.⁷ When the human family is really true to type—true, that is, to the divine model—peace and harmony, loving care and glad submission unite father and mother, parents and children in a bond of charity, mutual respect and joyful adaptation which make *the threefold cord that is not easily broken*, spoken of by the Preacher.⁸

One of the most beautiful things in family life is family prayers. The members of a family should not only have their joys and cares in common, they should likewise pray together, as did the Holy Family of Nazareth. Would that we might have overheard the wonderful conversations when, the day's task over, this earthly replica of the heavenly Trinity sat together—reading the Scriptures, or, if they were too poor to have a copy, relating to each other the various episodes they knew so well, praying together and singing the psalms. The psalms were the hymns of the people of God. Did earth ever hear such harmonies as when the voice of God's own Son blended with the sweet voice of Mary and the manly one of Joseph? Surely the angels in heaven must have been tempted to stop their own everlasting Holy, Holy, Holy, that they might listen to these sweeter songs which earth was then privileged to send up to heaven.

Family prayers would be a powerful solvent of the complications that are bound to arise in all families. They would knit its members ever more closely together. If Christ promised that where two or three are gathered together in His name, He would be in their midst, how much more will He be among those who are both of the same flesh and blood and are united in the yet stronger and more abiding bond of a common faith and trust in God?⁹

⁶ Jo. viii. 29.

⁷ Jo. xiv. 23.

⁸ Eccles. iv. 12.

⁹ The following family prayer may prove helpful :

O most sweet Jesus, who by Thy wonderful virtues and the example of Thy hidden life, didst sanctify the Family to which Thou didst choose to belong on earth, look graciously upon this our own family now prostrate before Thee. Remember that it is Thine inasmuch as it dedicates itself wholly to Thee. Mercifully guard it; preserve it from all harm, help it in all its needs and give it grace to reproduce the virtues of the Holy Family, to the end that, after loving and serving Thee on earth, its members may praise Thee for ever in heaven.

Holy Mary, sweetest Mother, we beg thy intercession, knowing that Thy Son will not be deaf to thy prayers.

Holy St. Joseph, together with Mary, offer our petitions to Him who deigned to pass for thy son and called thee by the sweet name of father.

Second Sunday after the Epiphany.

The event recorded in to-day's gospel occurred at the outset of Our Lord's public life. Its theatre was one of the most charming spots in Galilee. Cana nestles amid groves of oranges, date palms and pomegranates. At the entrance to the village a fountain yields abundant water: it may have provided the water that blushed at sight of its Maker and turned to wine of surpassing quality. Our Lord, with His Mother, and the disciples, was one of the invited guests at a village wedding. His presence, no doubt, attracted the curious. Oriental hospitality would not allow even these to be turned away. With a woman's instinct, Mary soon noticed that something was amiss. The wine had given out. She just mentions the fact to her Son.

His reply, which almost grates on our ears, is in reality most courteous: "Mother, let not this worry you. Up to now My hour had not come: now that the wine has given out, it is the moment for me to act. I will see to it that our hosts do not suffer either humiliation or inconvenience by reason of the crowd whom curiosity has attracted." The words: Woman, what is this to Me and to thee? are simply the *malesh* of the Palestinians of to-day. Intonation gives a hundred nuances to the little word: essentially it means, "don't worry," or "it does not matter!" The Evangelist does not relate the complete dialogue, but this is its gist.

Our Lord's miracles differ specifically from the "miracles" attributed to other founders of religious systems. His miracles are signs, hints given to men, tokens of His power. They are in keeping with all we know of Him. Everything about our Lord is always in character. He does not dazzle. He refuses to force or overwhelm the human mind. He allows us many a glimpse at what He is, but there is such divine reserve and reticence in His self-manifestation that though there is enough light, and more than enough, for the upright soul, there is also an element of mystery, one is almost tempted to say secretiveness, that make faith in Him meritorious and a refusal to accept Him a possibility. He "manifested His glory," says the sacred text. The glory of the man Jesus is to have been caught up into the splendours of the Godhead. Man though He remains, He is so united to the Eternal Word as to constitute with it but one Person. Hence omnipotence is His necessary appanage. Could anything be more glorious than for a human nature to be united to God, not merely by friendship or charity, as we are, but by a personal and substantive union?

It is highly significant that Jesus should have given the first hint of what He is, at a wedding feast. The incident is a true "Epiphany"—viz., a manifestation not only of the divine power, but likewise of the essential and most sweet loving-kindness, shall I say, the humaneness of Our Lord? Marriage is a holy thing, instituted and blessed by the Creator of mankind.

It is also a very human thing; hence it is for ever in danger of being debased and robbed not merely of its supernatural, but even of its natural dignity. In the dawn of the world Adam, in a divinely granted light, glimpsed the symbolic significance of this, the most primitive, the simplest and most necessary of all contracts. The natural union of man and woman, from being just a contract, has been raised to the dignity of a sacrament; that is, the contract is a sign and cause of supernatural grace whilst at the same time it points to, and typifies, the marvellous and utterly indissoluble union that knits the Church to Christ: *For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife. And they shall be two in one flesh.* This is a great sacrament (mystery): but *I speak in Christ and in the Church.*¹⁰

This lofty symbolism, even apart from Our Lord's emphatic assertion elsewhere, demands the indissolubility of Christian matrimony. That this is a "hard saying" no one denies. For that very reason marriage was made a Sacrament, so that the contracting parties might enter upon their joint existence with grace and strength to enable them to live in peace and harmony and to bear together the burdens which are inseparable even from the ideal marriage. Would to God that all men and women would think of marriage as something ordained by God, which for that very reason is withdrawn from human tampering or experimenting! The State may institute its divorce courts: it does so by a monstrous usurpation; for how dare man put asunder that which God Himself hath joined together?¹¹

The essential purpose of marriage is the propagation of the race. Sacrament though it be, and as such a thing of wondrous beauty, even Christian marriage only attains its fullest efflorescence when children come to enliven the home. Viewed in the light of faith, parenthood is a most wondrous participation in God's own creative power. Under God it is granted to parents to swell the numbers of God's elect. Even when we remain on the natural plane, the patter of little feet, the spring-like smile that lights up a dimpled face, the chatter of innocent lips will always prove both a compensation and an inspiration to parents—a compensation for the ceaseless anxiety and self-sacrifice which the rearing of children exacts, an inspiration to future devotion. By the most tragic of ironies, our age has styled itself the "age of the child"! Yet all the time, all over the civilized world, the child is looked upon as an encumbrance and a hindrance. Who seeks to deny, or to gloss over, the economic difficulties of our time? For all that, even though for a time a family may find itself in severe straits, children are a blessing and Christian parenthood is nothing less than a co-operation with the great Creator of mankind.

Our Lord did all things well. Of Him alone may it be said

¹⁰ Eph. v. 31, 32.

¹¹ Matt. xix. 6.

with absolute truth that "whatever He touched He adorned." There was but plain water in the great stone jars—He turned it into excellent wine. He found marriage a mere contract. Not only did He restore it to its pristine dignity by revoking the "privilege" of divorce, He made it a Sacrament of the New Law. When Christ laid down the law of indissolubility He "manifested His glory" as much as when He changed water into wine. No mere man would have laid down a law so utterly at variance with human passion—no mere man would have secured obedience to it.

Third Sunday after the Epiphany.

The Gospel of this Sunday is in line with the dominant thought of the Church at this season. At this time the liturgy's obvious aim is to put before the children of the Church such incidents in the subsequent life of the Saviour as show or manifest the divine attributes of the Child of Bethlehem. Since we are saved by faith in Christ as the Son of God, the authentic teacher of mankind leaves nothing undone in order that all men may come to the knowledge of this saving truth.

The incident at the wedding feast at Cana was a first proof of Our Lord's supernatural powers. His presence at such an event foreshadows, at least in the mind of us who read the gospel page as lit up by the experience of nineteen centuries, the tremendous change He was about to introduce into the most fundamental contract between man and woman. The institution of Christian marriage as an indissoluble bond, and its acceptance by countless millions is, in its way, a very wonderful epiphany or manifestation of the divine authority of Christ.

In to-day's gospel Jesus is revealed as the supreme Master of disease and death. The centurion was the commander of a small band of soldiers that guarded the high way from Damascus to the Red Sea. This road passed hard by Capharnaum. Here Matthew had his office, for he was at the head of the toll and excise department. The officer was not a Jew, but he believed in the true God; he had even built a place of worship for the Jews. What he had heard of the Master was enough to convince his simple, forthright soul. He believed in Jesus. But though he had at first asked Our Lord to come into his house, he suddenly feels a scruple: perhaps Jesus would be like other Jews who would not enter the houses of pagans. As a matter of fact, why should He trouble to come at all? Just as at his own word of command his soldiers went and came, so at a word of Jesus his servant would surely be healed.

It is a touching thought that, at a later date, Jesus should pronounce His great Eucharistic discourse in the synagogue built by the good centurion. More than that, the winged words spoken by that upright man, in which he professed himself unworthy to receive Christ within his house, are daily upon the lips of millions of believers at the moment when they prepare

to receive the heavenly bread so solemnly promised by Jesus on the shore of Galilee's lovely lake.

*Fourth Sunday after the Epiphany.*¹²

In the incident of the storm at sea, related by each of the synoptics, Jesus reveals Himself as Lord of Nature. Is there an element less easily controlled by man than the sea? and who can command the winds of heaven? Galilee's beautiful lake, when viewed from the steep hills that surround it, sparkles like an amethyst set in precious stones. It bears a rough resemblance to a harp, hence in the Hebrew Bible it is called *Kinnereth*—harp. But the music of the lake is not always like the sweet harmonies of the harp—there are times when its mighty voice vies with the loud roar of the ocean. And it passes from calm to storm with bewildering rapidity. The holy lake is as moody as a child—a thing of sunshine and squalls. The latter rise suddenly, whenever a strong, cool wind blows down the valley through which the Jordan rushes in its headlong course. Storms such as the one described in to-day's gospel are of frequent occurrence and the wary boatmen seem to sense the approach of a squall when the casual visitor suspects no danger.

Our Lord had been speaking all day. He did so eagerly, earnestly, and in the open. Apparently He had spoken from the boat, for when He expressed a wish to be rowed to the other side of the lake, the disciples took Him *as he was*, says Mark, that is, without additional clothing against the chill of the night. A sudden squall arose; *the waves beat into the ship*—but He slept on the cushioned seat of honour in the stern of the boat. They roused Him with loud cries, no doubt, and by tugging at His clothes. He rose in the boat—no small feat in a small, shallow barque tossed about by the wind and with difficulty riding the waves. He bids sea and wind be still, speaking to these elements as if they were rational beings. A great calm ensues; all is now well. But He rebukes the disciples. They did indeed believe in Him and in His supernatural powers, else they would not have cried to Him to save them, for they did not expect Him to save them merely by taking charge of the boat. Yet their faith was far from the unquestioning faith and trust Our Lord has a right to demand. History relates that when Cæsar sailed from Italy to the coast of Illyricum a violent storm threatened to capsize the ship. But the proud Roman reassured the trembling skipper: "Fear not," he said, "thou carriest Cæsar and Cæsar's fortune!" How much less ground for fear the Apostles had! Surely their boat could not sink since the Lord of the universe and the Author of life was their fellow-passenger.

¹² The last Sunday of January is Septuagesima, but this gospel will be read during the week, so that the sermon could be preached as a second sermon on either the third or fourth Sunday.

In this incident we have yet another epiphany, or self-revelation of Jesus. Wonderment and a mysterious awe filled the hearts of the witnesses of the miracle. They had been given yet another glimpse of the hidden glory of their Master. But once again the miracle is characterized by a truly divine simplicity, as well as by a marvellous peremptoriness. Unlike His Saints, Jesus need not invoke the divine help. He speaks and acts in His own name and authority. He is not a servant. He is Lord and Master, chiding the wind and bidding the sea be still. The moral is obvious: it is general and particular. The storm-tossed barque is the Catholic Church. In fair weather and in foul she sails towards her destined goal. The very winds that threaten disaster only swell her sails and sweep her on to new conquests.

Our own soul's experiences may well be compared to the fate of a ship at sea. If Christ is in the boat all is well. He may appear to be asleep, but He sleepeth not nor slumbereth that keepeth Israel.

Septuagesima Sunday.

Septuagesima ushers in a somewhat stern liturgical season: it constitutes a transition from the joyful weeks of Christmastide to the sober days of Lent. Though the penitential character of the latter season strikes the imagination more than the liturgical one, it is none the less true to say that the former is not the chief feature of Lent. The forty days, during several centuries, were essentially a period of instruction for the recruits to the Faith, hence, for the Church as a whole. Hence, the great variety in the scriptural readings of the season.

To-day's gospel is a fit and striking opening of this rich feast of spiritual nourishment. A parable is an elaborate tale, wholly imaginary or founded on fact, with a moral attached to it. There may be objective truth in the story; thus many people think that the parable of Dives tells a real occurrence. In any case, the house of Dives is pointed out to this day in the slimy street that leads up to the Holy Sepulchre. To-day's parable has struck the imagination of every generation. Commentaries on it are innumerable, but for the most part they are allegorical. It is such an explanation that is offered in the Roman Breviary. It was only to be expected that St. Gregory would just revel in explaining the mysterious significance of every detail. Yet St. Chrysostom was very wise when he said that we should not try to read significance into every word of a parable but that we should be content with attending to its main purport. To connect the various hours at which the householder engaged the labourers either with succeeding ages of the world's history, or with different periods of human life, is indeed lawful, but, for all that, it remains fanciful. All such "interpretations" are accommodated ones.

The purpose which Our Lord seems to have pursued in the

present parable was to show, in a manner that would make a spontaneous appeal to His hearer, the gratuitousness of the call to the kingdom of God, viz., the Church or the Gospel, and to the kingdom of heaven hereafter. As a matter of fact, the two calls are essentially one, for faith and grace are the seed of vision and glory. The supernatural life is a tree whose roots are in the soil of our world but the trunk and branches thereof grow into the sky, for even now *our conversation is in heaven* (Philip. iii. 20), and Our Lord definitely states that eternal life begins in time for *he that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood HATH everlasting life and I will raise him in the last day* (Jo. vi. 55).

The details of the parable are taken from daily life in Palestine, but none of them should be unduly stressed. The incidents must be allowed to remain subservient to the scope or main point of view. Anyone may see to-day, in some open space or near the gates of Jerusalem (and the same applies to any town) groups of idlers or would-be workers, waiting to be engaged for the day or the week. The Bible prescribes that wages be paid at the end of the day, *before the going down of the sun* (Deut. xxiv. 15). It would seem only natural that those who had worked for but one hour, when more often than not the breeze of the afternoon has become a strong, cool wind, should receive less than those who had toiled all day under the blistering sun of an eastern land. Yet when these last murmured, they were rebuked (but ever so gently, for their spokesman is addressed as "friend"). They had no real ground for complaining; had they not received the wage agreed upon in the morning? The similarity of the hire points to the essential identity of grace and glory. The beatific vision is the lot of all the elect, of those who can look back upon many years of service and of those who may have turned to God upon their deathbed. But the parable does not imply that though the reward appears to be substantially the same it is really identical in all respects. All the Saints see God, but they do not see Him alike or experience and enjoy the supreme Good with the same intensity. The point of the parable is the gratuitousness of the call and the reward: *Not by the works of justice which we have done, but according to His mercy; He saved us* (Tit. iii. 5); and *By grace you are saved and that not of yourselves, for it is the gift of God—not of works, that no man may glory* (Eph. ii. 89).

In His dealings with men God follows a twofold line of conduct. All His actions are prompted by justice and mercy; *all the ways of the Lord are mercy and truth* (Psalm xxiv. 10). When He rewards, He does so not only according to the strictness of justice; He also acts according to His infinite liberality, so that the reward invariably exceeds deserts: *good measure and pressed down, shaken together and running over* (Luke vi. 38). But even when God acts on what I may be permitted to call "compassionate grounds," that is, when His conduct is inspired solely by mercy, He still acts in accordance with justice, not only by reason of the essential identity of His attributes with the

divin
them

As
all
(I
glor
God
gifts
wou
ness
est
und
Eas
gene
all.
thos
libe

divine essence, but because our poverty and destitution are in themselves just and adequate grounds for His intervention.

As far as God is concerned all men are called, for *He will have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth* (I Tim. ii. 4). If grace does not in every instance issue in glory, the blame lies with the perversity of the human heart. God does not force the citadel of free-will; He does not force His gifts upon those unwilling to accept them. As for the just, they would cease to be so were they to find fault with the Lord's goodness to those who seem to have laboured less: *Tolle quod tuum est et vade*. Let us be content with our own gift; it is always undeserved. Let no one give "the evil eye" so dreaded in the East, to those who appear to be treated with unwarrantable generosity. Their gain is no loss to us and there is enough for all. In any case, the ways of God are for ever unfathomable, those of His distributive justice as much as those of His liberality.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

I. ECONOMICS AND SOCIOLOGY.

BY THE REV. LEWIS WATT, S.J., B.Sc.(Econ.).

Mr. Henry Somerville, well known for his work in connection with the Catholic Social Guild, has now left England to take up his residence in Canada, but it is to be hoped that the most recent book from his pen¹ will not be the last that he will publish on this side of the ocean. It is a remarkably interesting account of what Catholics have done and are doing on the Continent to promote social justice along the lines laid down by the Holy See. There are a couple of chapters on France, three on Germany, two on Belgium, one on Holland, and a particularly useful discussion of Catholic social ideas in Austria. A final chapter deals with the Catholic Trade Union movement. Properly to understand such an encyclical as *Quadragesimo Anno* one must know something about the currents of thought in countries where Catholics are able to play an important part both in social theory and social practice, and until the publication of Mr. Somerville's book it was extremely difficult to obtain that knowledge. Students of international affairs as well as those of sociology will be grateful for this very readable account of social thought and action in the countries with which it deals. Mr. Somerville draws attention to what he calls "the mystery of France," viz., the alienation of the working class from the Church in spite of a vigorous Catholic social movement. The weakness of that movement has been that it has never had a concrete programme of legislative reform to put before the electorate, differing in this from the movement in Germany, Holland, and (to some extent) in Belgium.

A well thought-out attempt has recently been made by M. Emmanuel Lacombe² to provide the outlines of such a programme. In the first half of his little book he considers Sunday rest, unlawful speculation and unemployment (in the first chapter) and the family (in the second). The whole of the second half is taken up with what the French call "organisation professionnelle," i.e., the organization of those vocational groups or corporations of which *Quadragesimo Anno* speaks. On each question M. Lacombe describes the actual state of French law, compares it with the Catholic ideal, and suggests methods by which the latter may be achieved through a development of the former. This is a thoroughly practical bit of work,

¹ *The Catholic Social Movement*. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 3s. 6d.

² *Les Eléments d'un Programme social catholique*. Maison de la Bonne Presse. 6 francs.

and one would welcome something on similar lines for England.

The desire for such a concrete programme of social reforms is what distinguishes the Catholic social movement from such Christian reformers as Dr. A. D. Lindsay, the Master of Balliol. It would be difficult to express more strongly than he does in his recently published lectures³ the importance of inspiring the economic system with the Christian spirit, but he holds that to provide a social programme is outside the province of the Church. He defends his attitude on the ground that "the choice of a specific remedy for a defect is in part a political and technical matter," and that therefore it should be left to politicians and technicians. Surely a more logical conclusion would have been that it should be left *in part* to them. The Catholic Church has expressly repudiated any intention of dealing with technical economic questions as such, but it is an essential part of her apostolic office to define the natural rights and duties of men, whether considered individually or collectively, and to point out how far any given economic, political or social system conflicts with them. She has her own ideas as to the purpose which any economic system ought to serve, and as to the value of social institutions in view of that end, just as much as she has her own authoritative teaching about the spirit which should govern the relations of men with one another. She is as much bound to demand just wages and just prices as she is to condemn class-warfare; and she is as much entitled to urge the formation of joint industrial councils to secure industrial peace and justice as to denounce excessive hours of labour, the exploitation of women and children, and the dictatorship of finance-capital. Dr. Lindsay admits that he does not agree with Mr. Tawney's commendation of the mediæval Church for her "detailed lists of condemnations of anti-social practices," and argues that she was not entirely successful in enforcing them because the clergy laid down rules for merchants instead of inspiring them to lay down rules for themselves. The obvious reply is that the merchants consulted the clergy to know what their moral duty was. It is equally obvious that if the Church had laid down no moral rules at all no one could have charged her with lack of success in enforcing them. That her success was not even greater than it was is explicable in exactly the same way as her failure to make every man, woman and child a good Christian. It is, of course, a failure which she shares with her Head and Founder.

That Dr. Lindsay's point of view is not shared by the most active members of the (non-Catholic) Christian Social Council is evident from a book just published by the Rev. V. A. Demant, who is Director of Research to that Council.⁴ After affirming the necessity of "continuous moral appeal which the Church can make to individuals or in public," Mr. Demant goes on to

³ *Christianity and Economics*. Macmillan. 5s.

⁴ *God, Man and Society*. Student Christian Movement Press. 6s.

press upon the Church the additional task "of encouraging changes in social structure as a whole which will make it easier for men to practise the natural virtues." Mr. Demant, while entirely loyal to the Anglican Church, is very sympathetic with the Catholic point of view, and is not afraid to show appreciation of the work of the mediæval Church. Unlike many non-Catholic social reformers, he has studied such Catholic sociological books as exist in English, including *Quadragesimo Anno*, and evidently finds himself in agreement with their general position. He is a bright and original thinker, and does not hesitate to criticize the conclusions of "Copec" when he considers them mistaken. It is possible that he arouses opposition, even in his own communion, by his energetic advocacy of the Douglas theory, but his convictions on this point of currency reform, though frankly admitted in this book, are not obtruded on the reader. Mr. Demant raises more problems than he solves, but they are real problems which ought to be raised, and which ought to be considered and discussed by all who are anxious for the social reign of Christ. Mr. Demant, it may be noted, accepts Weber's thesis that Calvinism is responsible for the development of what is sometimes called the "capitalistic" spirit, the desire for more and more profit as an end in itself.

This thesis has recently been combated by Mr. H. M. Robertson in the first volume of a new series entitled "Cambridge Studies in Economic History."⁵ Mr. Robertson begins with an examination of Weber's theory that Puritanism introduced the concept of "vocation" as applied to layfolk pursuing their *avocations* in the world. There follows what is perhaps the best chapter in his book, an account of pre-Reformation capitalism, which should do much to correct the idea that the Middle Ages knew nothing but the Peasant State. An examination of the economics of the Renaissance State leads Mr. Robertson to the conclusion that the spread of the capitalist spirit in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is partly due to the Renaissance, partly to the rise of the merchant-class to political power. Some interesting details of economic history are contained in the last chapter ("The influence of the discoveries"), but practically the whole of the rest of the book consists of a not too veiled attack on Jesuit commercial morality. Mr. Robertson admits that he has drawn largely on Jansenist sources for his information about the Jesuits, but thinks he has justified this extraordinary method of arousing prejudice against the Society by assuring his readers (in a footnote) that "there is no reason to suppose that the descriptions of the trading activities of the Jesuits are untrue in any material particular. In the cases where I have quoted Jesuit opinions from Jansenist sources it will be found that I have not allowed any Jansenist exaggeration to enter." He makes the calm suggestion that his readers should do what he has failed to do, viz., refer to the Jesuit theologians

⁵ *Aspects of the Rise of Economic Individualism.* Cambridge University Press. 10s. 6d.

whom the Jansenists are attacking. This is indeed a novel method of writing the history of ideas, and hardly worthy of Cambridge.

No more need be said on the point here, as Mr. Robertson's attack is to receive careful examination by Father J. Brodrick, S.J., in a book to be published shortly.⁶ On the general economic question, it is a curious fact that a non-Catholic writer should now be striving to show that Catholicism did not oppose the evolution of commerce, industry and finance, whereas not so long ago Father Balmez and others were having to defend the Church from the charge of hampering that evolution and so standing in the way of material prosperity. How often one has heard the conditions in economically backward Spain contrasted with those in "Protestant" Holland. Mr. Robertson, however, holds that "it might almost be said that the expansion of Dutch trade and the development of the commercial spirit were carried on in spite of the Calvinist Church rather than because of it." While not conceding, of course, that national welfare is to be judged exclusively by an economic standard, one may suggest that this opinion of a Cambridge economic historian is worth quoting when next the accusation is made that prosperity and Protestantism necessarily go hand in hand.

In connection with the question of capitalism and the capitalist spirit, the attention of all serious students of morality in its applications to modern economic developments must be drawn to a most important work, *The Modern Corporation and Private Property*.⁷ This book had the honour of being mentioned as authoritative in evidence by an American economist before the Senate Committee on Stock Exchange practices. The central problem which it raises is that of the effect of the joint-stock limited company upon the institution of private property, particularly in view of the schism it has introduced between the ownership of property and its control. In the course of the discussion (which covers 357 pages, apart from appendices) many facts about modern capitalism are brought to light. Particularly noteworthy is the growth of the giant "corporation" (or company, as we should say in England). If a corporation's assets are less than fifty million dollars it falls into the class of small corporations in the U.S.A. The two hundred largest non-banking corporations in 1930 controlled nearly half of all (non-banking) corporate wealth, the remainder being owned by more than 300,000 smaller companies. It is estimated that at least three quarters (probably more) of all American business wealth is owned by corporations; so that at least 38 per cent. of business wealth is controlled by the two hundred largest corporations. The actual control of over half the industry of the U.S.A. is in the hands of a few hundred

⁶ See also *A New Charge Against the Jesuits*, in *The Month*, November, 1933.

⁷ By Adolf A. Berle, Jr., and Gardiner C. Means. Macmillan: New York. 3 dollars 75.

men (*op. cit.* p. 46, note). But parallel with the growth of the size of the industrial unit has come a dispersion of its ownership, with the consequence of a growing concentration of the control of the shareholders' property by those who direct the corporations; for the more the ownership of stock is dispersed, the more difficult it is for the stockholders to exercise control, on account of the smallness of their individual holdings. How this control is exercised, and in whose interests and with what results, is admirably analyzed and described in this book. It is evident that all moralists will have to take such facts as these into account in future when discussing the right of private property. For the financial side of modern capitalism, the student would do well to read the newly issued book on money which has been edited by the indefatigable Mr. G. D. H. Cole⁸ and in which he and other Oxford economists treat such important matters as currency, central banking, credit, foreign trade, investment and finance. There is a chapter devoted to "monetary heretics" like Major Douglas and Professor Soddy,⁹ and another in defence of the socialization of banking. Space must be found just to mention a most useful Catholic book on imperialism,¹⁰ an admirable work of solid research into fact and theory.

II. MODERN CATHOLIC LITERATURE.

BY THE REV. S. J. GOSLING.

Of all the books that have been sent to me for notice in these pages the most interesting is undoubtedly Mr. Compton Mackenzie's *Literature in My Time*.¹ I hope I am not exaggerating its importance, but my enthusiasm may be pardoned when I explain that Mr. Mackenzie's time exactly synchronizes with my own. To peruse this book is for me and my generation a sort of literary "Cavalcade"; at one moment thoughts and emotions come back to us across more than a quarter of a century with all the vividness and clarity of yesterday's experience; at the next we are amazed at the wide gulf that separates us from the judgments, the likes and dislikes of thirty years ago—and the ignorances, though at the age of twenty we did not seem to be so ignorant as we know we are now. And it makes us realize, too, the hidden power of literature; forty years ago Mr. Mackenzie and myself were reading the same books, and by that I mean that we were discovering the same books, not merely that we were being given the same books by our parents and teachers; and yet, I suppose, it would be difficult to find two children with more dissimilar environment and upbringing. Truly I was amazed to find that books which I had thought were my own private discovery, part of the special adventure that I call my

⁸ *What Everybody wants to know about Money*. 544 pages. Gollancz. 5s.

⁹ On whom see also an article by Mr. Somerville in *Studies*, September, 1933.

¹⁰ *Le Droit de Colonisation*, by J. Folliet. Paris. Bloud et Gay. 30 fr.

¹ Rich & Cowan. 6s.

life, were being read at exactly the same time by Mr. Mackenzie, away in London, or the Highlands, or wherever he lived, with the same sense of having slipped into an intimate private circle of whom he was the chosen and special friend. How many thousands of our contemporaries, I wonder, had the same experience?

This fact throws some light on a question often debated: What, if any, effect is produced by current literature on the opinions and morals of the people who read it? Some hold that it has no effect, since literature is but the expression of opinions generally held and is, therefore, not a cause of them. It is a debate that probably will never be settled, like the dispute as to which came first, the chicken or the egg. We are too far away from the beginnings of things to decide, we can only say now that literature and life react on each other. But in this connection Mr. Mackenzie has observed a curious fact, namely, that the books of which one generation disapproves because they are too outspoken, are frequently recommended by the succeeding generation as classics for the edification of its children. This would seem to argue a progressive decadence of public morals—or, as some would claim, a progressive frankness—at any rate, progress of some kind. But a wider view and a more catholic experience of literature convince us that what progress there is, is in cycles. Each age has a distinguishing mark, a new emphasis on some special characteristic, but fundamentally, literature, like life, remains unchanged. We are always being asked to express disapproval of the current fashions in women's dress, on the ground that they accentuate the feminine appeal for masculine admiration, regardless of the fact that that always has been and always will be the reason for the changes in fashion. It is not any particular fashion that attracts attention, even morbid attention, but its newness, as a glance at the illustrations of bygone dresses will prove. And so it is with literature. We have been busy sifting, filing, and docketing the sins and virtues of the Victorian age: its *dossier* may now be said to be complete. The Edwardian age is coming in for attention. It is a fascinating occupation, and Mr. Mackenzie brings to the task a wide experience and a clever, if not very profound, critical ability. He is always interesting, because he himself is so intensely interested, though he says many things with which most of us would most violently disagree. For instance, he is, in my opinion, most unfair to Francis Thompson.

It is difficult when reading a poet like Francis Thompson to acquit him of a deliberate literary pose which we should never dream of imputing to a poet like Richard Crashaw. . . . He is a stray spark from a conflagration which had burnt itself out two centuries before he was born. The overlaid rococo of Crashaw's English too often becomes in Thompson's hands what seems the deliberate affectation of a faith hiding its unreality in superfluous and meaningless ornamentation.

Does that mean anything beyond the fact that Thompson was not a child of his age? Wherever he touched contemporary life, it bruised him. It is a hard judgment, and surely a cruelly unjust one, to say that because Victorian materialism spurned him, his isolation was a pose.

I have given, perhaps, a disproportionate amount of space to Mr. Mackenzie's book, but my excuse is that its subject matter is the same as that of these notes—a review of current literature. It is true that among all the modern English authors that Mr. Mackenzie mentions I can only count a baker's dozen of Catholic names. That strikes me as being a very meagre total. Mr. Mackenzie may reply that we are entitled to no more. But I could have wished that those few had been treated with more assurance as explicitly providing a standard of Catholic culture with which other and non-Catholic writers might have been compared.

Before leaving Mr. Mackenzie I ought to mention his *Water on the Brain*,² a very amusing book, though it is a good thing he wrote it, and not someone else, otherwise the public might have thought it was an unkind skit on his own "Athenian Memories."

There is an unpleasant-sounding word recently come into fashion—"debunking"; but since it fittingly describes an equally unpleasant thing, it may be said to have justified its appearance. The idols of a previous generation have in all ages been compelled to submit to a more searching and less kindly examination at the hands of its successor; that is how the judgment of posterity has selected the Immortals. But in our day the process seems to be enjoyed for its own sake, and "debunking" biographies are written about men whose fame has died long since and who have to be resurrected from a decent grave in order to be buried again with dishonour—a ghoulis business. Since, however, there is in most of us a sneaking love for the *macabre*, "debunking" books are bound to be popular. Professor Stockley has exhumed Thomas Moore, "the poet."³ But surely there is no one who now regards Moore of the Irish Melodies as a poet. He was, I believe, unsurpassed as a writer of songs, but the rocking-horse metre which he affected and which his friends called "lilting," his too facile tears, his air of gentle melancholy, his sad, brave smile—these are not the habiliments of the true poet.

Professor Stockley does not trouble himself overmuch about Moore's poetry, but he proves that Moore's Catholicism was of a very wishy-washy kind, and as for his patriotism, the author, *more Hibernico*, considers it by reason of Moore's English associations more of an insult than an honour. The "debunking" is complete. Moore's religion on this showing was of that Liberal school which affects to be more Christian than Christ, emphasizing His loving forgiveness, and carefully suppressing

² Cassell. 7s. 6d.

³ *Essays in Irish Biography*. Cork University Press. 6s.

any reference to the Divine Wrath. While Moore was "sunning himself in Paris," Eugène de Guérin was writing, "I have never been able to understand the security of those who place their whole reliance in presenting themselves before God upon a good conduct in the ordinary relations of human life." Here we touch upon a problem of far wider application than the mere criticism of an ease-loving Irish poet. Can we say that "God is Love" and leave it at that, forgetting conveniently that "it is a terrible thing to fall into the hands of the living God"? Or is it not rather that the truth is hidden in our inability to comprehend the infinite? Theologians tell us that God's Justice and His Mercy are the same thing, and if we keep our minds uneasily balanced on a metaphysical plane we can persuade ourselves that we can see that it is so; but in fact we cannot. As soon as we relax our intellectual effort we tumble down to thinking of these attributes by their effects, and then mercy is one thing and justice is another. Perhaps the safest rule to follow in this dispute as in many others is to remember that an affirmative is more often right and a negative is more often wrong. God is infinitely just and infinitely merciful; we can go on affirming either of these propositions with absolute safety. It is only when we begin to use the one to deny the other that danger opens beneath our feet. There are many who strive to stifle their conscience by reiterating their belief in the lovingkindness of God. Such a one appears to have been Thomas Moore, poet, patriot, and Catholic. His Catholicism was never allowed to interfere with his own desires or to obtrude itself on the susceptibilities of his Liberal friends; his patriotism was never strong enough to endanger his popularity in England; and as for his poetry, it might have passed muster if it had not been so extravagantly praised by those who sought to see in him an Irish Burns.

Probably Mr. Morton is tired of hearing the name Rabelais in connection with his *Hag's Harvest*,⁴ but if so, he has only himself to blame, for there are passages in the book which must have been written in deliberate imitation of the French humourist. The word focusses the discussion on to what is the book's claim to distinction. Mr. Morton is a humourist; that will be granted. It has been said that Rabelais is the only humourist the French have produced; and furthermore, that the English and the Spaniards are the only people in Europe who understand humour. It will be gathered that we are now in the region of definitions, walking warily on the knife-edge distinction between wit and humour. In Mr. Morton's book there is plenty of wit that needs no bush. But when we read that Mr. Morton's hero, Shindillar, roaring at the stretch of his lungs, drank three bottles of red wine before beginning on a Gargantuan feast, what are we to call it, wit or humour? Do we seek, as Horatio objected, to inquire too closely, to inquire so? But why not, since these

⁴ Heinemann. 8s. 6d.

things are set down for us to read? Gargantua at a sitting ate forty-three oxen, one hundred and two sheep, three score and sixteen quails, one hundred and twenty-seven partridges. Is the Frenchman a greater humourist than Mr. Morton? Or is the latter a more timid one? Obviously they are of the same kind, in spite of differences of degree. Mr. Morton evidently balked at the prospect of making his hero consume whole hecatombs of animals at a meal: is he thereby less humorous than his French prototype? Or more? The question is worth answering, because in other respects Shindillar is just as boisterous and full-blooded as Pantagruel. True, he is not coarse, and *Hag's Harvest* is not rabelaisian in the vulgar meaning of that word; the book may safely be given by any modern girl as a present to her parents. But again, does that mean that Mr. Morton is a lesser humourist, or a greater? Frankly, I cannot bring myself to admire the rabelaisian touch, which may argue my lack of a sense of humour. Yet I can read Swift, who in his way was equally extravagant; and I can read Cervantes, and, with even greater delight, I can read Mr. Morton when with delicate irony or cutting satire he exposes the humbug of modern hypocrisy. But these ramping, roaring, wine-swillers give me a headache.

Mr. Chesterton has written *St. Thomas Aquinas*⁵ as a companion volume to his *St. Francis of Assisi*, and by comparing these two friars he has used their superficial divergences to illustrate their underlying unity. No man could do it better than Mr. Chesterton; of all living writers he is the most patient with the ignorances and prejudices of his readers. He never loses his temper, and he is never afraid of repeating himself if by reiterating an argument he can drive it home. At this time of day it would be impertinence to comment on Mr. Chesterton's cleverness. He is clever, of course; but his cleverness does not consist so much in the verbal agility with which he is usually credited, as in his knowledge of the mental confusion of the average non-Catholic Englishman. It must not be inferred from that remark that I think that Catholics are invariably clear-headed. It might be a good thing if Mr. Chesterton criticized more frequently some of our wrong notions. The fact that he does not do so illustrates another characteristic of the good schoolmaster that Mr. Chesterton is; he is not concerned with the vagaries of those who are, so to speak, not in his class. His self-chosen class consist of average Englishmen who know a little, read a little, think a little, and on this tenuous substructure erect a mass of opinions to the honour and glory of Englishmen and the confusion of all foreigners. Mr. Chesterton is not the only one who has been moved to protest against this national pretentiousness, but most of the others have turned away in disgust or have allowed their anger to get the better of them and have become apologists of every country but their own. Of this company are our modern Liberals, and to listen to them is like listening to a roomful of chronic dyspeptics;

⁵ Hodder & Stoughton. 2s. 6d.

nothing is right for them. Now Mr. Chesterton is a Liberal, and he has even called himself a Little Englander, but he has never lost his temper with John Bull. Instead, he has sat down before the imposing façade of national conceit and with abounding good humour and immense gusto has examined it, so to speak, stone by stone—with what results the reading public know well, perhaps too well, for Mr. Chesterton's mannerisms have developed into a trick, a trick that always comes off, but a trick, nevertheless. In St. Francis we thought he had the subject most perfectly adapted to his genius, but his latest book makes us revise that opinion, so easily does he move among the metaphysical speculations of the Schoolmen. This book should do an immense amount of good if non-Catholic readers are not put off by Mr. Chesterton's mannerisms. It is a pity he is so clever, because those who do not agree with him have an easy way of escape: "Very clever," they say, after reading one of Mr. Chesterton's devastating arguments, "but if I were as clever as G. K. C., no doubt I should be able to see the answer."

Those who had the privilege of reading Paul Claudel's *The Satin Slipper* will welcome the appearance of *Ways and Cross-Ways*.⁶ Having seen and appreciated a completed masterpiece, it is no slight honour to be introduced into the master's studio and allowed to see his work "in the rough." That is not an unfair description of the notes and essays that make up this volume. That they do not suffer by being seen in an unfinished, or at least an unpolished state, is a proof that M. Claudel does not rely mainly on literary grace for his success. With French directness he goes straight to the heart of his subject, and whether writing an essay for a French paper or lecturing in English to an American audience, his aim is to present the Catholic view of whatever subject he is discussing. One cannot help contrasting this logical directness with the roundabout methods pursued by most of our native Catholic authors. There seems to be a notion among them that any expression of Catholic dogma or discipline must be heavily coated with minimizing and non-committal phrases to ensure its being read by the general public. I doubt if this is necessary nowadays when people are on the lookout for some definite leading; and in any case the method is not calculated to do much good, for all this verbiage merely creates an impression that the writer is intellectually diffident.

No such charge can be levelled against Mr. Douglas Newton in *The Beggar: And Other Stories*.⁷ The stories may not be of high literary worth, but they are well devised and developed in a workmanlike manner, and their atmosphere is that of sound Catholic thought, without sentimentalism and without that note of needless apology that is so irritatingly prevalent in many similar books.

⁶ Sheed & Ward. 7s. 6d.

⁷ Washbourne & Bogan. 7s. 6d.

On what may be called, without offence, the mechanical side of literature, Father Stephen Brown, S.J., has been for many years an acknowledged authority. He has produced several works on Catholic bibliography, and his latest is his best, *Introduction to Catholic Booklore*.⁸ I have seen it stated that there are several omissions from this book: I am not surprised; the chapter headings alone make one wonder how one man can have the courage to tackle such a stupendous task. Here is collected in one handy volume information about Catholic bibliographies, bibliographical sources, Catholic reference books, bibliographies of Religious Orders, Catholic Institutes of Higher Studies, and Catholic publishers. Every one who has to deal with Catholic books will acknowledge his indebtedness to Father Brown.

MORAL CASES

INDULGENCES.

A certain amount of confusion having arisen in the wake of the recent legislation on Indulgences, will you kindly give us a summary of the various decrees issued, and a *practical* solution to the question of the *number* of prayers to be said for the Pope after (1) the Stations of the Cross; (2) the "En Ego"; (3) the Rosary; and (4) the Office said before the Blessed Sacrament, to all of which in normal years there is attached a Plenary Indulgence.

If, during the Holy Hour, one says the Rosary and finishes the Office (the previous part of which has already been said before the Blessed Sacrament) what prayers are to be said in order to gain the three Plenary Indulgences involved? (B. J).

REPLY.

The number of new indulgences, modifications of those existing, and the revision of rules affecting indulgences in *genere*, have been very considerable during the last few months. It would be impossible to summarize them within the limits of an answer to a question, but an article on the subject might prove useful in the pages of this REVIEW. In the meanwhile, the best and most recent study of the whole subject is *Tractatus De Indulgentiis*, by A. Gougnard.¹ The most notable changes, in the indulgences which are in constant use amongst the faithful, are: the stabilization of the indulgences attached to the *Way of the Cross*, and the withdrawal of the power to obtain faculties to indulgence objects by joining some association such

⁸ Burns Oates & Washbourne. 5s.

¹ Dessain, :933.

as the *Catholic Truth Society*. It is unnecessary to consider here the complications arising during the Holy Year with regard to indulgences other than the Roman Pilgrimage.

(i.) In order to gain the indulgences attached to the *Stations of the Cross* no vocal prayers are strictly necessary, but it is a laudable practice to conclude by praying for the Pope's intentions. If, however, a specially blessed Crucifix is used, *Pater Ave and Gloria* once is normally required as a necessary condition for gaining the indulgence.²

(ii.) For the *En Ego* indulgence some vocal prayer for the Pope's intention is necessary. Without limiting the devotion of the faithful, and certainly without discouraging mental prayer as well, it has been the teaching of authors for many years that *Pater Ave and Gloria* five times suffices, whenever vocal prayer for the Pope's intention is numbered amongst the conditions for gaining indulgences, and the practice was sanctioned by the *Sacred Penitentiary* on the occasion of the Jubilee in 1925.³ It is true that quite recently *Pater Ave and Gloria* "six" times has been determined, but this applies strictly only to the Portiuncula and to certain others of a similar nature.⁴ Some thought that, in the process of stabilizing indulgences, "six" times would be determined for them all, but the October 2nd number of the *Acta*⁵ opportunely contains a decree of the *Sacred Penitentiary*, September 20th, 1933, definitely deciding that it suffices to recite *Pater Ave and Gloria* once only: "Clausulae vero 'precandi ad mentem Summi Pontificis' plane satisfieri adiiciendo ceteris operibus praescriptis recitationem ad eam mentem unius, ut aiunt, *Pater Ave and Gloria*, relicta tamen libertate singulis fidelibus, ad normam Canon 934, §1, quamlibet aliam orationem recitandi juxta uniuscuiusque pietatem aut devotionem erga Romanum Pontificem."

(iii.) The indulgences attached to the Rosary, in its various forms, are very many, but prayer for the Pope's intention is not usually required. To answer this query exactly it is necessary to know which particular indulgence is referred to.

(iv.) The plenary indulgence attached to reciting the Office before the Blessed Sacrament⁶ is granted "suetis conditionibus" and, therefore, requires some vocal prayer for the Pope's intention.⁷ *Pater Ave et Gloria* five times suffices.

(v.) The correct interpretation of conditions attached to indulgences becomes even more difficult when it is proposed to gain several at once, and I would hazard the view that it is not the mind of the Church that the faithful should exercise their

² *S. Penit.*, August 8th, 1859, and October 20th, 1931.

³ A.A.S., XVI, 1924, p. 342.

⁴ *S. Penit.*, January 13th, 1930, and July 5th, 1930.

⁵ A.A.S., 1933, xxv. p. 446.

⁶ *S. Penit.*, October 23rd 1930.

⁷ *Periodica*, 1930, p. 343.

ingenuity in this way, killing two birds with one stone, as it were. "Opere, cui praestando quis lege aut precepto obligatur, nequit indulgentia lucriferi, nisi in eiusdem concessione aliud expresse dicatur. . . ."⁸ "Uni eidemque rei vel loco plures ex variis titulis adnecti possunt indulgentiae; sed uno eodemque opere, cui ex variis titulis indulgentiae adnexae sint, non possunt plures acquiri indulgentiae, nisi opus requisitum sit confessio vel communio, aut nisi aliud expresse cautum fuerit."⁹

To solve the problem submitted with some degree of success, it must be determined, firstly, whether prayer for the Pope's intention is required in each of the indulgences mentioned. For the indulgences attached to the Holy Hour¹⁰ prayer for the Pope's intention is necessary; for the recitation of the Rosary before the Blessed Sacrament a plenary indulgence was granted by a brief of Pius XI, September 4th, 1927, but prayer for the Pope's intention is not mentioned amongst the conditions;¹¹ for the indulgence attached to the recitation of the Breviary, prayer for the Pope's intention is necessary, as explained under (*iv.*) *supra*. From the terms of Canon 933 it is necessary, in my opinion, to fulfil the condition of prayer for the Pope's intention twice, in the circumstances mentioned in the question. In addition, though the point is not raised, it would appear, from Canon 932, that it is necessary to offer some other prayer during the Holy Hour, in addition to the Breviary which is already of obligation.

E. J. M.

WOMEN IN CHOIRS.

It would be convenient to have the text of the various laws and decisions relating to the lawfulness of female singers in the choirs of our churches. (C.)

REPLY.

The *Motu Proprio* of Pius IX on Church Music, November 22nd, 1903, states in n. 13 that women being incapable of exercising liturgical offices may not form part of the choir "le donne, essendo incapaci di tale officio, non possono essere ammesse a far parte del coro o della cappella musicale." It might seem that this was merely a statement of a general principle, and that no one ever contemplated women singing in the liturgical choir on the sanctuary of a Church, still less of a cathedral. But a reply of the *Congregation of Rites*, September 17th, 1897, shows that abuses of this kind actually existed. "An servari possit mos in aliquam ecclesiam, etiam cathedralem, invectus, ut mulieres et puellae intra vel extra ambitum Chori

⁸ Canon 932.

⁹ Canon 933.

¹⁰ *S. Penit.*, March 21st, 1933.

¹¹ *Periodica*, 1927, p. 128, ad 4.

canant in Missis solemnibus, praesertim diebus per annum solemnioribus? Resp. Invetam consuetudinem utpote Apostolicis et Ecclesiasticis praescriptionibus absonam tamquam abusum esse prudenter et quamprimum eliminandum. . . .¹

Further explaining this decree, another one appeared after the Motu Proprio: "... cum in Motu Proprio . . . praecipitur ut 'cantus Gregorianus in populi usus restituendus curetur, quo ad divinas laudes mysteriaque celebranda magis agentium partem, antiquorum more, fideles conferant' quaeritur: Licebitne permittere, ut puellae ac mulieres in scamnis sedentes, ipsis in Ecclesia assignatis, separatim a viris, partes Missae cantent; vel saltem extra functiones strictae liturgicae, Hymnos aut cantilenas vernaculas concinant? Resp. Affirmative ad utrumque, et ad mentem. Mens est: Ubi viri et pueri suam partem convenienter, tamquam Chorus seu *Schola Cantorum*, conferre possunt, mulieres et puellae canentes a reliquo populo non distinguantur, salva separatione virorum a mulieribus, ubi laudabilis huiusmodi servatur consuetudo; et ubi praesertim officiatura choralis habetur, cantus exclusivus mulierum non admittatur, nisi ex gravi causa, ab Ordinario agnoscenda; et cauto semper ut quaevis inordinatio vitetur.² It may be noted that the text of this answer, as contained in the 1928 edition of *Decreta Authentica*, differs from the text published at the time and discussed in contemporary periodicals. The earlier version is simpler to understand: "Mens est ut intra Christifideles viri et pueri, quantum fieri potest, suam partem divinis laudibus concelebrandis conferant, haud exclusis tamen, maxime ipsorum defectu, mulieribus et puellis."³ The meaning is that women may sing with the rest of the congregation, an instruction which appears almost unnecessary. As Woywood says, "The decree as reported in the *Decreta Authentica* is so obscure in its wording that nothing certain can be concluded from it."⁴

On December 18th of the same year a further reply was given for America, where conditions obtain which are very similar to those in this country. In the question it was explained that by the choir was meant "quidam coetus paucorum cantorum, tum foeminarum quum virorum, qui seliguntur ad officium textus liturgicos intra Missas solemnes cantandi. Hic chorus . . . in loco eius soli usui destinato extra cancellos, immo plerumque longissime ab Altari positus est, nec alius habetur Chorus, qui textus liturgicos cantet vel recitet." The question recalls the decision of January 17th (the text in the 1928 edition of *Decreta Authentica* is the text of the earlier version) and asks whether, in view of this decision, a choir of this character is lawful. The answer was "Prout exponitur negative et ad mentem. Mens est, ut viri a mulieribus et puellis omnino sint separati,

¹ *Decreta Authentica*, n. 3964.

² January 17th, 1908, n. 4210, ad II.

³ *Periodica*, 1908, p. 163.

⁴ *A Practical Commentary*, II, p. 63.

vitato quolibet inconvenienti, et onerata super his Ordinariorum conscientia" (n. 4231). The object of the query was to learn whether a mixed choir in an organ gallery at the end of the church was liturgically correct. But the answer regarded the matter from a moral point of view, for the strictly liturgical question appears to have been sufficiently dealt with in the decree of January 17th, the only difference being that the sexes are more closely mingled in an organ gallery than in the nave of a church. Some have pointed out that the organ *console* is an adequate separation and that, in any case, a mixed choir, to be effective, must have the soprano and alto singers in separate groups from the tenors and bass.⁵

A summary of the law, therefore, is that women are never allowed in the liturgical chancel choir; they may, of course, sing in the nave of the church with the rest of the faithful, but in an organ gallery they must be separate from the male singers; a choir exclusively composed of women may be permitted by the Ordinary for grave reasons.

E. J. M.

EPISCOPAL FACULTIES.

Is it permitted the clergy in general to know what faculties are possessed by their Bishops for dispensing from matrimonial impediments and other laws of the Church? If so, is the text of these faculties obtainable? (D. C.)

REPLY.

(1) The "ordinary" jurisdiction of the bishops, and its extent, can be studied in the Code, and there is nothing private or secret about it. "A generalibus Ecclesiae legibus Ordinarii infra Romanum Pontificem dispensare nequeunt, ne in casu quidem particulari, nisi haec potestas fuerit explicate vel implicate concessa, aut nisi difficilis sit recursus ad Sanctam Sedem et simul in mora sit periculum gravis damni, et de dispensatione agatur quae a Sede Apostolica concedi solet."¹ The meaning of this episcopal *charter* is explained by commentators on the Code, and in particular by J. Brys in *Collationes Brugenses*, 1929, p. 142. The exact nature of this episcopal power is a matter of discussion, but it appears that Brys expresses it correctly as follows: "Infra limites descriptas secundum Can. 81, potestas illa dispensandi sese extendit ad omnes leges ecclesiasticas, valetque pro foro tum interno, tum externo, sive pro casu particulari, sive pro tota communitate aut certo loco. Estque potestas *ordinaria*, cum ipso jure adnectatur officio stabiliter erecto, et proinde est delegabilis."

(2) The question refers chiefly to faculties which have been expressly conferred on Ordinaries for use outside of the circumstances of Canon 81. For countries subject to *Propaganda* very

⁵ The subject is further discussed in *Music and Liturgy* (Society of St. Gregory, 252-260, Regent Street, London, W.1), Jan. 1933, p. 11. Cf. also *Tablet*, April 3rd, 1909, p. 542.

¹ Can. 81.

wide and detailed faculties are given. The *formula* can be obtained from the Vatican Press and there exist various explanatory commentaries. The most complete, I think, is by Vromant, *Facultates Apostolicæ quæ Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide delegare solet Ordinariis Missionum. Commentaria in Formulam Tertiam*.² A supplement issued in 1930 incorporates in the commentary recent decisions and interpretations. Similar commentaries on these Propaganda Faculties may be consulted in *Jus Pontificium*, Vol. III, p. 193,³ and in *Periodica*, Vol. XI, p. (33) seq.⁴

(3) For countries subject to the ordinary discipline of the Church special faculties are sometimes obtained, and they are occasionally printed in the *Acta Apostolicæ Sedis*. Thus, decennial faculties for South America are printed in A.A.S. (1929), p. 554-557, and reprinted in various periodicals.

(4) Usually the faculties given to Ordinaries are quinquennial. They are issued from the *Consistorial Congregation* and contain the various delegated faculties from the respective Congregation within whose competence the grant lies. It appears that copies are not offered for sale, but they are occasionally found reprinted in periodicals and in certain commentaries on the Code either wholly or in part, e.g., *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, XXII, p. 410; XXX, p. 645. *Collationes Brugenses*, XXIII, pp. 161, 411, 323. Wernz-Vidal, *Jus Canonicum*, V, p. 503, note 67. The formula issued to Bishops in the United States is translated in Woywood's *Practical Commentary*, Vol. II, Appendix V, p. 684. From such sources as these one may obtain a general idea of the faculties usually conceded to Ordinaries, but unless the Ordinary of the place chooses to print his *formula* for the information of the clergy, as happens occasionally in *Collationes Brugenses* (an exceptional proceeding), there is no assurance that the powers of any individual bishop exactly correspond to the *formulae* publicly printed. Nor is there any very *practical* reason why they should be published. A priest needing a dispensation from some law applies to his Ordinary, and more often than not, gets what he wants; it is a matter of purely academic interest whether the Ordinary possesses delegated faculties for the purpose, or whether he himself has to apply to the Holy See on each occasion.

E. J. M.

EUCCHARISTICA.

1. Do the words "*expandens manus*," as distinct from "*extendens*" at the Veni Sanctificator in the Offertory of the Mass, mean that the hands should first be turned palms upwards, and then extended, etc? (Many priests have been taught this method.)

² Louvain, Musaeum Lessianum. 1926.

³ Piazza SS. Apostoli 51, Rome.

⁴ Beyaert Bruges.

2. Does Canon 1265 (note 3) in any way imply that the Blessed Sacrament may not be carried either privately or publicly to a place outside the church for the purpose of giving Benediction?

3. What authority is there for the oblique position of the Missal when a Gospel is read at the *end* of Mass? (SAGGART).

REPLY.

ad 1. As far as I can discover there is no radical difference between "expandens" and "extendens" in this rubric. Since the hands are previously joined and resting on the altar, it seems a more natural movement to separate and elevate them without consciously turning the palms upwards. O'Callaghan interprets the direction "expandit manus easque in altum porrectas jungens" as follows, "he separates his hands and elevates them."¹

ad 2. Certainly, it is an abuse to carry the Blessed Sacrament publicly or privately, solely for the purpose of giving Benediction. "Delationem SS. Sacramenti extra Ecclesiam non esse permisam, nisi occasione solemnis Processionis in Festo et per octavam Corporis Christi, necnon occasione infirmorum, et orationis XL Horarum, juxta Sacrorum Canonum Decreta."²

ad 3. The S.C.R. answered affirmatively to the following question: "... auctores et professores Liturgiae sacrae docent ultimum Evangelium in fine Missae, eadem prorsus modo dicendum esse prout primum, i.e., Sacerdote *oblique* stante, sive parum per suam sinistram converso ad populum. Cum tamen alii, praesertim seniores, Sacerdotes negent talem esse sensum huius Rubricae: quaeritur: Num ultimum Evangelium a Sacerdote *oblique* stante recitari debet?"³ It may be noticed that the use of a side chart is a late introduction, used in place of a Missal, although the priest may not need either, if he knows the Joannine prologue by heart. Many priests in using the chart do not stand obliquely, but it appears to be incorrect.

E. J. M.

¹ *Sacred Ceremonies of Low Mass*, p. 90.

² *Decreta Authentica*, n. 640.

³ *Decreta Authentica*, n. 3792, ad 5.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

BY THE REV. A. BENTLEY, Ph.D., M.A.

CAPITULAR AND PAROCHIAL RIGHTS (*Continued*).

Last month's analysis is here completed by a *précis* of three more responses given by the S.C. of the Council (A.A.S., XXV, pp. 315, 374, 436).

(v) *The Right of Patronage.*

At Castelspina in Piedmont, within the diocese of Alessandria, a parish subject to lay patronage fell vacant in 1926. By a convention drawn up in 1756, the right to nominate the parish priest belonged to the local Council and the heads of certain families. Endeavours were made in accordance with canon 1451 to induce the patrons to renounce their right, but without result. An election, therefore, was publicly announced and carried out. The first scrutiny failed to yield an absolute majority for the highest candidate. In the second scrutiny another candidate received thirteen votes out of twenty-three, and was therefore presented to the Bishop for canonical institution. An appeal to uphold the result of the first scrutiny was quashed by the Bishop, but carried subsequently to the Sacred Congregation.

The appellants urged that the procedure indicated in canon 1460, §2, ought to have been followed; and that in any case the election was invalid since a section of the citizens failed to record their votes through absence from the town.

In reply, the S.C. first establishes the validity of the patrons' right through the convention of 1756, which has now been continuously followed for the better part of two centuries; next, the fact of collegiate patronage through family representation, and the consequent insufficiency of a *relative* majority in the first scrutiny (canon 1460, §1); thirdly, the obligation to exclude from voting all who live at a distance from the town, or who attempt to vote by letter or agent (cf. canon 163). Timely notification of the election had been given, and the procedure followed along correct lines.

Qu. *An decretum curiae Alexandrinae diei 17 Ianuarii 1927 sustineatur, in casu.*

R. *Affirmative, seu standum decreto Ordinarii.* (March 21st, 1930.)

(vi) *Parish Cemeteries.*

In a certain town "N," which now possesses a population of about 200,000, a single parish "A" had built a cemetery for the whole Catholic community. In 1912, the cemetery was extended and the cost was again defrayed, for the most part,

by the same parish and its *paroecia filialis*. By the year 1929, another cemetery was considered necessary, and the parish priests of the town agreed to make over the older cemetery to the two parishes most closely interested.

Giving his sanction to this arrangement on December 27th, 1929, the Ordinary decreed that henceforth no one outside the two parishes should be allowed to purchase burial plots or be buried in the old cemetery. Objections were raised, and the S.C. was called upon to intervene. It was alleged that the faithful were being deprived of the right to choose their place of burial, guaranteed by canon 1223; that serious wrong was done to those who had expended large sums on the old cemetery; and that no urgent necessity could be pleaded, since the cemetery was capable of serving the whole population for another twenty-five years.

In a letter, dated October 29th, 1930, the Ordinary explained that the real purpose of the decree was to make a practical division which would encourage the remaining parishes to combine in meeting the cost of the cemetery. It was not intended to destroy the individual's right to choose his place of burial, but merely to fix a norm. Thereupon, the S.C. approved the action of the local curia understood in this light. It recalled canons 1223, 1227 and 1229, which define the liberty allowed to each individual; but went on to show that by canon 1208 the Ordinary has the right to decide upon the common burial ground of each parish, and so to forbid burial, unless it be by way of exception, in a cemetery belonging to another parish. An exception is provided, for example, by canon 1223, whenever it can be proved that the deceased person had in fact exercised the right admitted by the canon. Another exception may follow from the possession of a family grave.

Qu. *An et quomodo recursus parochi A . . . diei 2 Augusti 1930 excipiendus sit, in casu.*

R. *Recursum esse reiiciendum et ad mentem. Mens est ut, praeter sepulturam gentilicium ad tramitem canonis 1229, salva fiat sepultura legitime electa ad normam canonis 1226, collati cum canone 1228 Codicis I.C.* (July 11th, 1931.)

(vii) *The Obligation of Mass "pro populo."*

Are the rectors of *de facto* parishes, which have never been canonically established, and whose income consists of the voluntary offerings of the faithful, to be considered true parish priests, bound by the canonical obligation of offering Mass for their people? What if they are merely *vicarii perpetui* of churches which have not even been *de facto* erected into parishes, but have nevertheless their own separate territory and are entirely independent and cut off from the parent parish? These *dubia* are solved by the S.C. in a response to the Bishop of Prince Albert and Saskatchewan.

In the constitution of a parish, canon 687 requires a decree

of erection, giving it juridical personality and determining its subjects and boundaries, which will remain immune from all prescription (cf. canons 1418 and 1509, §4). Failing such canonical erection, a church, the Bishop submitted, could scarcely be considered a parish. Its rector, therefore, was not bound by canons 475, §2, and 476, §6; nor, in a recently-formed diocese, could any custom exist to induce such an obligation.

Against this view, the S.C. points out that neither the Code nor the older legislation demands a formal decree for the valid constitution of a parish; its canonical status can be gathered also from such elements as *de facto* make up a parish—fixed territory and boundaries, a group of the faithful, a rector or parish priest having the care of souls, and lastly the authority of the bishop preserving and approving such an arrangement (cf. S.C.C., March 18th, 1881, in *Collectanea S.C. de Propaganda Fide*, II, n. 1548). Hence Ferraris: “(Parochia) erecta . . . praesumitur auctoritate Papae vel Episcopi *ex lapsu temporis* quo rector ecclesiae publice divina officia peregit. . .” (*Bibl. can.*, s.v. *Parochia*, n. 10).

No valid contrary argument can be based on canons 687 and 1418, or on a decree of the Consistorial Congregation dated August 1st, 1919 (A.A.S., XI, p. 346). For canon 687 deals merely with pious associations of the faithful; some of these may have been constituted into *personae morales*, others merely approved or commended by authority. Even in constituting a “moral personality,” collegiate or otherwise, a formal decree is not always and necessarily demanded. Canon 100, §1, expressly lays it down that such a status may occasionally result from the law itself. And personality arising *ex lege* may be either affirmed in so many words, or inferred from the fact that an institution or association is declared *capax iuris* (cf. canons 324, 531, etc.). The Consistorial decree and canon 1418 speak of an “Instrument” required for the constitution of a benefice. This is not strictly the same as a formal decree of erection; nor, though demanded *ex praecepto*, is it necessary for validity.

The powers of a *vicarius paroecialis* may depend on the terms of his appointment, or on diocesan statutes, or on the decision of the parish priest (canons 474-476). If from these sources he has actually received full powers in the parish, he is placed on the same footing as a parish priest (canon 451, §2, n. 2), and is therefore bound by the obligation of the *Missa pro populo*.

Qu. I. *An parochi teneantur ad Missam pro populo applicandam, in casu.* II. *An vicarii perpetui eadem obligatione teneantur, in casu.*

R. *Ad I. Affirmative. Ad II. Affirmative, si plena potestate paroeciali sint praediti* (March 20th, 1932).

BOOK REVIEWS

The Letters of Stephen Gardiner. Edited by James Arthur Muller. (Cambridge University Press. pp. xxxviii., 573. 31s. 6d.)

Stephen Gardiner, after many centuries, is at last coming into his own. The chief authors of this restoration are the editor of the present collection, who also, a few years ago, wrote his life, and M. Pierre Janelle who has edited for these same publishers Gardiner's classic defence of the Royal Supremacy, the *De Vera Obedientia* (*Obedience in Church and State*). To these competent scholars, for their laborious toil, all students of sixteenth century history and a much wider Catholic public as well cannot but be grateful. For few historical problems still interest Catholics, at any rate, so keenly as that of the fall of the hierarchy in the reign of Henry VIII. The main events of that story are familiar, but we have too little of that detailed knowledge of the men who fell to warrant us in assessing, should we be interested to assess, their culpability, too little to be able to say with certainty by what mental process they arrived at their decision. Gardiner was not indeed of those who voted for the Supremacy in 1531—he was not a bishop until late in that same year. But, if he was ever after the champion of Catholic beliefs against Cranmer's innovations, he was none the less the equally staunch champion of Henry VIII as against the Pope.

Like practically all the great English churchmen of his day it was to skill in the Law that Stephen Gardiner owed his success, to his expert acquaintance, that is, with the Canon Law and with the Civil Law, and in this last he was lecturer at Cambridge when, through a professional encounter with Wolsey, his first chance came to him. He was then, perhaps, twenty-seven. Seven years later, having passed to the King's service and having toiled at Rome in the business of the divorce, he was at, thirty-four, Bishop of Winchester with an income of some £100,000 a year of our money. He was thenceforward Henry VIII's leading diplomat. and, for the last six years of the reign, the chief minister. Under the child Edward VI Protestantism ruled, and for his opposition Gardiner spent most of the reign in the Tower. Mary's accession liberated him. He was reconciled to the Church, and named Lord High Chancellor, still holding which office he died at Whitehall, half way through the reign, on November 12th, 1555. He was still two years short of sixty.

These 173 letters (90 of them now printed in full for the first time) are what remains of this statesman-bishop's personal correspondence, their originals scattered in half a dozen libraries

and archives. With them are printed, in appendix, five most interesting documents, among which are a letter from Cardinal Pole congratulating Gardiner on his return to the Church, and the Herald's long account of the bishop's splendid funeral—the long journey from Southwark to Winchester, across the whole length of the ancient see's vast territory, with the clergy of every parish assembled before the parish church, as the hearse passed, to asperge and incense the coffin and the solemn Mass of Requiem each morning in the church where it had rested overnight. The editing has been remarkably well done, there is a good introduction, and abundant help to whoever would use these letters as the important sources they are, and an index that is a model of its kind. For the production—its excellence is summed up in the publisher's name.

The Letters show us turn by turn the patriotic statesman—never was there a more English Englishman—the Renaissance scholar, mightily concerned (he was Chancellor of Cambridge) with the pronunciation of Greek and master of a fine Latin style, the doughty opponent of Protestantism, and one of the earliest of English writers to use that strong, classically formed style which gives to whoever possesses it place among the very greatest of their race. "Be neyther in comunicacion to sharpe," he instructs Bonner, going ambassador to France, "wherby youe shold exasperate them, be duller in language thenne the case shal requyre." Again he threatens the negligence of Cambridge's Vice-Chancellor: "The last yere, by consent of the hol Universite, I made an ordre concernyng pronounciation of the Greke tonge, appoynting paynes to the transgressours and finally to the Vicechaunceler, if he sawe them not executed; wherein I pray youe be persuaded that I wyl not be deluded and contempned. I did it seriously and wyl maynteyne it. If youe see the transgressours punished I have cause to be contented, but otherwise I entende, in your and the proctours persons, to use myn auctorite geven me by the Universite; wherunto I trust ye wyl not enforce me. To be Chaunceler of the Universite is oonly honnour, which by contempt is taken awaye; and I wylbe ware to geve any cause to other to contempne me."

The Pope is spoken of, in new and unprecedented style, as "the Bysshop of Rome," the Cardinal who will one day absolve him is, of course, "the traytour Pole," and we catch a glimpse of what "is said and doon at Trent in ther conciliable, where be gay wordes." There is a wonderful description of the rites accompanying the meeting of the Knights of the Golden Fleece with Charles V presiding, and, in lighter vein, arguing against the abolition of Lent the bishop can recall how his administration as victualler for the fleet earned him the nickname "Steven Stockfish." He never hesitates to introduce a "merry tale" if it will illustrate his point, or enliven a dull subject—a trait for which Henry VIII blessed him more than once. Thus his story of the uncouth German ambassador "rude and grosse, who, when he shuld have delyvered his letters to the French

King, put his hand in his poket to take out his letters, and first pulled out, in stede of letters, a pece of chese, and thenne pulled out a pece of bakon, and thenne a lumpe of bred, and finally his letters, and soo delyvered them; wherein was set forth very barbarie." More startling is another remark, as he argues against the Edwardine injunction that the *Periphrasis* of Erasmus on the Gospels should be read in the churches "By the Paraphrasis the keeping of a concubine ys called but a light thing. And that were good for Lankeshire. . . ."

What were Gardiner's own feelings about the episcopal surrender? To Pole's letter of congratulation he replies, as Mr. Muller notes, "touching very lightly on the subject." Nor is there any reference to it in any of the letters. But when he came to die he asked that the Passion might be read to him, and as they came to the story of St. Peter's denial the dying bishop said: "Peccavi cum Petro, exivi cum Petro, sed nondum fleui cum Petro."

To understand Stephen Gardiner is to understand the critical years 1531-1540, and towards that understanding these letters supply much new and hitherto inaccessible material.

PHILIP HUGHES.

Lafayette. A Revolutionary Gentleman. By Michael de la Bédoyère. (Jonathan Cape. 15s.)

Those familiar with *The Drift of Democracy*, one of the Essays in Order, will be prepared for the distinction of thought and precision of expression which mark Count Michael de la Bédoyère's writing. In this new volume Lafayette is studied against his background. The man is described, his mannerisms and his ambitions. An avoidance of extraneous detail concentrates attention upon the central figure. Among the new school of biographers it would not be difficult to find others who share these merits; but three points give this study its special value. In the first place it is lighted throughout by a cool and ironic wit, continuously refreshing. Then the lucid study of the principles underlying the French and American Revolutions has a real importance enhanced by the author's calm and judicious sympathy for democracy. Finally, it is the first study of Lafayette and his period in which the full implications of his attitude to Catholicism are revealed. The book belongs to the best style of Catholic historical writing, objective and utterly unprejudiced. But few save Catholics would notice the full implication of the Easter Duty in Louis XVI's last troubled years or be able to describe so carefully the inter-action of ideas in the long married life of Lafayette and the Catholic Adrienne. The American scene, the relations with Napoleon, the long drawn-out struggle with Mirabeau are admirably described. In this last episode some may find the characterization of Mirabeau too severe. But there can be no two opinions of the discerning treatment of "Gilles-César." So many lines of his thought are traced out for us, the foretaste of Gladstone, the links with Washington. Lafayette stands before us a living man.

A paragraph on his religious attitude just before he died has a particular interest. "He showed," we are told of Lafayette, "some interest in religion and the clergy, though, despite the presence of the Curé of his parish at his death-bed, there were never any signs of Adrienne's last prayer for his conversion being answered. The last book he was ever to read was Lamennais' *Paroles d'un croyant*. It was a pity perhaps that he struck on a work which was to cause considerable scandal in the Church and great suffering to its author. But to another generation of Catholicism the words of Lamennais would have been more welcome. It was a revelation to the stern Deist that a Catholic apologist priest could be so liberal-minded: 'I never thought that the Abbé de Lamennais was more republican than I; his book is well written and full of enthusiasm; it will make a sensation and produce scandal among the believers to whom it is addressed.' He was right." This passage shows clearly the wide range of the book from Louis XVI to Lamennais.

D. M.

Anthologie Mystique, par P. De Jaegher, S.J. (Desclée. pp. 376. 12 fr.)

Profane anthologies of all kinds are common enough; but religious anthologies are scarce, especially in France. To do something to supply the need is Fr. De Jaegher's purpose in compiling this collection. His work does not claim to contain the finest passages of the mystics, because these would not be understood by the ordinary reader; but the passages chosen are characteristic of the writers. The compiler prefaces each group of selections with a short biography and delineation of the mystic. He has made excerpts, in French, from twenty authors, beginning with Hadewych (twelfth and thirteenth century) and closing with Gemma Galgani. All the greatest mystics are included; and also Lallemant, Surin, Caussade and Anne Catherine Emmerich. Of English mystics, only Dame Julian of Norwich is quoted (in four extracts). A useful analytic table is appended, listing the authors under the important spiritual subjects of which they treat. In an excellent preface the author explains clearly the good to be gained by everyone from a judicious reading of the mystics.

J. C.

Les Grands Jours De La Rédemption. (Maison de la Bonne Presse. pp. 128. 10 frs.)

This Jubilee Year book commemorates the chief events to be celebrated in the Holy Year as they are enumerated by the Holy Father. The plan is to give first the scriptural account, then the testimony of the Church in her councils, then the testimony of doctors and theologians, and finally extracts from great preachers. The volume is beautifully printed on excellent paper, and contains a number of full-page illustrations copied from the great masters.

T. E. F.

THE CHURCH AT HOME AND ABROAD

I. ROME.

BY THE REV. R. L. SMITH, Ph.D., M.A.

It is three months since I wrote my last Roman notes and during that time the pilgrim flow has risen again in full spate. Only the figures to be published next year will show exactly how much effect the summer heats have had on the Holy Year invasion, but to one walking the streets there was little to mark the inevitable slackening. The familiar black crosses, held on high, still led long lines of people across the furnace spaces of the piazzas outside the four basilicas; yellow and white badges abounded in the trams and the 'buses; one was constantly stopped and asked the way to obscure pensions in the furthest reaches of the Prati, Parioli or leagues beyond the Porta Salaria; *torpedoni*, labelled with the names of hotels, still bore down upon scurrying pedestrians; and worried directors halted at busy corners to collect throngs of gesticulating women. Many picturesque pilgrims who had come on foot, one even carrying a cross, by dust-rimed bicycle or sagging donkey, formed the core of excited crowds and dislocated an exasperated traffic. Graceful Indian women in their native costume, Breton fisher wives with an intriguing diversity of coifs, dignified Eastern prelates in wonderful colours, Chinese and Japanese and others of God's far flung family found their groups increased by friendly curiosity to enormous proportions. A Scots pilgrimage joined the Indians on the condition that each should pray for the conversion of the others' country. The basilicas themselves rang with a multitude of different melodies at once, all sung to the limit of human lungs, for in no other way might a pilgrimage keep time with itself. It needed the ear of faith to detect the harmony with which this discordance certainly reached up to Heaven. Only in the Vatican could one recapture a sense of calm—the delicious old Roman refrain "*Piano signori—non spingere—c'è tempo, c'è tempo, c'è ne sempre.*" And therefore it must be the measure of the autumn increase in the number of pilgrims that when I was last in audience, even the Vatican had lost something of its repose, and perspiring *bussolanti* doubled about demanding of an over-occupied world "*Ma come mai, come faccio io?*" As one of them remarked for the benefit of all who might care to listen: "This palace is the largest in the world, everyone knows that: but even here space is limited." The Holy Father himself has had to discontinue his practice of giving his ring to every pilgrim in the larger groups, and the frequency with which he breaks this rule of his doctors shows how little he likes it, but also how necessary it is. Despite the multiplying of his speeches, the effort and strain of being the *Padre Commune*—this Pope's favourite title for

himself—he yet keeps well and active, though often he looks a very tired man. And he has begun to count the number of organized pilgrimages from the United Kingdom—forty-five now, and we shall soon be fifty-two, one for every week in the year. An official at the station told me that in the first five months the railways carried more people than during the whole of 1925. *Laudetur Iesus Christus Qui exaltatus a terra omnia trahit ad Seipsum.*

October 28th, the anniversary of the March on Rome, has been celebrated as usual by the opening of many public works throughout the country. Here, in the city, the *Via del Impero* has been carried along the old *Via San Gregorio*, now renamed the *Via dei Trionfi*, from Constantine's Arch to the Archæological Walk. It is a magnificent street, though it cannot compare with the *Via del Impero*: the views of the Palatine are dull on this side, but across, on the Celian, San Gregorio is now left to tower above its flight of steps in quite lordly isolation. Still, it is a tomb of a church inside, cold with all the cold of neglect, and a grievous disappointment to Englishmen who value its history and their own. When one thinks what a Roman Saint Gregory was and that to him, more than to any other man, we owe the restoration of Roman civilization in Europe, it reflects badly on Baroque Rome that though it could not leave the mediæval church alone, neither could it run to marble, but considered white and gold plaster good enough for the father of his country. And modern Rome has so forgotten him that it leaves his family palace to three decrepit Camaldolese, while it grubs about for the mere foundations of any insignificant classical house. But to get back to the new road! The papers are full of discussions over the complete encircling of the Palatine by another great highway that shall cut under the Aventine somewhere near the old Jewish Cemetery, revealing the Circus Maximus and the imposing arches which carried the imperial palaces above. If this project is completed, few cities will be able to compete with the round from the Piazza Venezia by the *Via del Impero*, the *Via dei Trionfi*, the *Via del Circo Massimo* and the *Via al Mare* back to the Piazza Venezia again. And it will not only open up the Rome of the Cæsars, but quite a little of the Rome of the Popes on the Celian, the Esquiline and the low-lying land round about, from Santa Maria in Cosmedin to San Buonaventura high up on the Palatine. Equally interesting to Englishmen is the vast extension to the old hospital of Santo Spirito, to whose foundation King John contributed with extraordinarily good grace. This new block has provided, incidentally, a fine new stretch along the Tiber, prominently named *Lungotevere* in Sassia, thus preserving the memory of our ancient settlement in the Borgo—a fine example of the right conservatism.

Turning to the world beyond the walls, these three months have seen plenty of incident without much clarification of the issues. There have been no important pronouncements from

the Vatican; it is as if the Holy Father were now biding his time and waiting for the logic of events to justify his diagnosis and his remedies. The rôle of prophet carries no advantages to compensate its dangers, and yet I am tempted to foretell further extensions of Fascism in its broader sense. This year of grace has seen its triumph in Germany and its inauguration in Austria. The practical contribution of Fascism to world government is the system of the Corporate State, and one cannot say much about it as it is not yet in complete working order even here in Italy. But the present month seems likely to gather the fruit of all the preliminary study and experience which have been accumulating at fever heat since 1929 and earlier. I think it is clear that the Corporate (if you like it better, the Corporative) State is capable of being made to fit into the frame of *Quadragesimo Anno*, and that is the avowed aim of Chancellor Dolfüss. But the broad principles of Corporation include equally well the régimes in Russia and Germany where the State is held to be the final arbiter of all relations between capital and labour, between trade and trade, between competition and amalgamation, between the relative values of prestige and uneconomic production, between tiding over bad times and cutting one's losses. The spirit which animates this arbitration will determine any Catholic judgment upon the whole scheme in each separate country. It is the constructive corollary to the Fascist outlook which begins in a negative despair of all Parliamentarianism, and one seems to see signs of this despair in other countries besides the avowedly Fascist States. Modern Spain's experience of her new Republic is a disillusioned experience of politicians who have proved themselves incapable of learning a single lesson from anything that has happened in their own lifetimes. The Spanish Revolutionaries are true to their reputed national type in being at least fifty years behind the times and in trying to make a new Spain out of the threadbare rags of a long discredited Liberalism. But it is typical of to-day that the late Dictator's son is building up a counter party not only on impatience with the present Cortes, but on contempt for all Parliamentary government. That is the authentic Fascist note. He may not come to power for some time, but the march of events in Europe is in his favour. Austria has taken a leaf out of Hitler's book to counteract his propaganda within her borders; Poland has borrowed from Moscow to defy Moscow. And, as far as a Westerner may understand the East, Siam seems to have embarked on the current Parliamentary struggle almost before she has had any experience of a Parliament's benefits, let alone its defects. There is no evidence that France is tired of it yet, but there is ample excuse for her being so. The United States are experimenting with a dose of Fascist practice, whatever the doctrine under which it may masquerade: the fight between President and Big Business is a fight over the whole philosophy of Fascism. Is it any wonder, then, that Signor Mussolini should remark on the way Fascism is becoming not only an Italian but a world-wide

receipt for all our ills? In each country it will present different features, but so long as the necessity of doing something overrides all deeper considerations of whether that something is objectively the best possible in the long run, so long Fascism will thrive and spread. This is its psychological breeding ground, and the defenders of democracy must needs confess that they have only the manifest abuse of their own system to thank for the existence of this new phenomenon. Once the air is cleared of crisis, its continuation will depend on the permanent value of the Corporative system of government which it is slowly evolving. That very slowness gives hopes of its quality, tested, as it is being, in the crucible of experience. The Corporative Council meets in Rome this month at the summons of Signor Mussolini, and I hope to give some account of it in my next Roman notes.

II. ESTONIA.

BY FATHER VASSILI,

Missioner in Estonia.

Until the year 1919 the history of the Estonian people was a matter of eight hundred years of servitude to various masters, who were rarely beneficent. They were first a race of hardy fishermen and daring hunters, mixed up with their neighbours the adventurous Vikings, whose exploits they often shared, and then gradually became a peaceable agricultural people. As a western branch of the Ungro-Finns they are racially and culturally distinct both from the Slavs and the Germans, and, while the Finns of North Russia mingled with the Slavs of Kiev and produced the Great-Russians, the Finns of Estonia, ancestors of the Estonians of to-day, jealously kept their national characteristics and have remained ethnologically and linguistically distinct from the Russians.

In 1208 the southern part of Estonia was conquered by the military order of Sword-bearing Knights, and seventy-one years later the north of the country was occupied by the Danes, when the Danish king, Waldemar the Great, founded the present capital city, called Reval in Russian and Tallin (i.e., "Dane-town") in Estonian. The whole country was subjected to the Teutonic Knights in 1345, and these Knights converted the inhabitants to Christianity. But it was not a thorough conversion, so that at the "Reformation" in the sixteenth century the Estonians easily became Protestant and passed into the domination of the Swedes, after having been for a short time under the sovereignty of Poland. Under their new masters their condition became more happy; in 1630 King Gustavus Adolphus founded a university at Dorpat (now Tartu) which achieved celebrity. But in 1721 Estonia, together with the other Baltic States, became a province of the Russian empire.

It is surprising that after so many vicissitudes, after centuries during which all the peasants were in a state of serfdom and

their language and culture excluded from public life, that anything Estonian should be left at all. Nevertheless, after 1917, Estonia was, with Finland, the first to claim independence. This was gained definitely in 1920, after the country had been twice overrun by hostile armies, German and Bolshevik.

What is left of Catholicism in Estonia after all this? In 1520 the whole population was still Catholic; to-day, of 1,160,000 people, only some 2,000 are Catholics—and they are mostly Poles and Germans: these and ruined buildings throughout the land, some of them magnificent, such as the former cathedral whose huge roofless walls still dominate from a hill the city of Tartu. Most of the Estonians (about 800,000) are Lutherans, and of the rest 200,000 are Eastern Orthodox; this Orthodox community dates only from the middle of the nineteenth century.

Now, there is to be discerned among the Estonians a certain dissatisfaction with these two prevailing cults. An extreme manifestation of this may be seen in the group which, wanting to have a national religion, has taken up the worship of a pagan deity, Tara, who was honoured by their ancestors. The Lutherans would like to get rid of the Germanic sympathies of their pastors, who were friendly towards the Baltic barons whom the people at large remember with detestation.

As for the Orthodox, they are greatly attached to their faith and its liturgy (which they celebrate in Estonian), but they have not succeeded in finding a solid foundation for their hierarchy since they were constituted an independent eparchy (diocese) in 1920. Some 80,000 of the Orthodox of Estonia are Russians, and this group is a source of constant difficulties; recently the Russian Bishop Johan publicly disobeyed Mgr. Alexander, who is the Metropolitan of Tallin and an Estonian. A number of articles about these troubles have appeared in various journals, and some responsible members of the Estonian Orthodox clergy have considered whether they should not approach the Roman Church in order to establish the order and discipline of which they feel the need.

The Catholic Church is not trying to profit from the misfortunes of the dissidents; but she is faithful to the age-long mind of the papacy, which has suffered so grievous a wound ever since the schism of the East in 1054; and she wants to find a way of keeping herself loyally before the eyes of those in Estonia who are seeking truth and wish to lead an interior life with Christ without being disturbed by party-strife. So, welcoming all men of goodwill from wheresoever they may come, she has this year begun a work specially directed in view of the Orthodox, at Narva, where two Catholic priests have opened a chapel of the Byzantine rite. One of them, the present writer, has recently come to England to try and interest English-speaking Catholics in his work.

It must be understood that the two Orthodox groups in Estonia differ greatly in temperament, according to the respective races. The Russians are more oriental, rigorous observers of their rite

and Eastern customs, fiercely opposed to Latinization of any kind; the Estonians are Westerners, more positive and "practical," keen men of business, and temperamentally stubborn.

The all-embracing love of Christ's Church extends equally to the one and the other. A school was opened at Narva last July, and at once seventeen small children were sent there, to be taught by the Catholic religious. These are the Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart, a new congregation founded in 1927 and exclusively of the Byzantine rite.

[EDITORS' NOTE.—The Byzantine liturgy and customs, of equal age, authenticity, and dignity with the Latin usages of the West, are used by seven million Catholics and one hundred and forty million non-Catholics (the "Eastern Orthodox") in many liturgical languages, Greek, Slav, Rumanian, Arabic, etc.]

REVIEW OF REVIEWS

The November MONTH opens with an article by Fr. Brodrick, S.J., in which he deals trenchantly with some statements made by Dr. Robertson, in "Aspects of the Rise of Economic Individualism," accusing the Jesuits, and de Lugo in particular, of approving "sweating." This very able defence is cast into the form of a trial, a method made popular by A. P. Herbert's "Misleading Cases," which reveals de Lugo's innocence so completely that the Jury asks for the case to be stopped. The Judge remarks that it should never have been brought to action, but an old lady at the back of the Court was heard to mutter: "All the same, I am quite sure the Jesuits approve of sweating. Everybody knows what they are like." Fr. Steuart, in some reminiscences of the War entitled *Dark Days*, has no particular thesis to defend, but his vivid description of a chaplain's life in Flanders in the Spring of 1918 will be read by all ex-chaplains with sympathetic understanding, and also, no doubt with the secret hope that the next war will find them too old for active service. The Editor in an article entitled "Anglicanism merely a Schism?" pierces the armour of those Anglicans who profess their regard for the Holy See, as the centre of the Church, yet act as though there were no such thing. It is followed, very fittingly, by a description of a journey to Rome by rail, an experience still fresh in the minds of many who have made the Roman Pilgrimage.

There appear to be fewer articles than usual in the November BLACKFRIARS, with a compensation in the length of each which many will think an improvement, and all tastes are catered for. It contains a first-hand account of the *Group Movement* by Julian Southwell, some reflections on the spirit in which Theology should be studied by Fr. Luke Walker, O.P., and a well-conceived appreciation of the poetry of Mr. W. Force Stead, a recent convert to the Church, by Mr. Robert Sencourt. His best poetic work is compressed into a poem of thirty pages,

and if quality not quantity is the criterion, the title of the article, *A New Catholic Genius*, is not unmerited. Fr. Conrad Pepler, O.P., pleads for a proper understanding of the essential things in liturgical worship, and that its inner spirit should predominate and not be crowded out by a mass of external detail. It is absolutely true that the growth of the liturgical movement is impeded by the liturgical maniac, whether it be in the popularization of plainsong or the use of the Missal and other liturgical books among the laity.

Mgr. J. McMahon, of New York, well-known to many of us in England, has also something to say on the subject of liturgical functions in the November ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, and his wide parochial experience lends added weight to the series of well-defined reasons which he gives in answer to the question, *Why Liturgical Functions are not Popular*. Some of these reasons reflect on the personal religion and good sense of the faithful, but it is more apposite in this journal to mention the last reason outlined, which is probably also the most radical, namely, the failure of many of the clergy themselves to appreciate the deep significance of liturgical worship; the failure, where it exists, he thinks, is due to ignorance, indifference, carelessness and personal prejudice. A nice example of all these is the case of the priest who urged his colleague to push through with the prophecies on Holy Saturday, while he himself blessed the Font at the other end. But the genial Monsignor rightly sees some excuse for the clergy in the *zelus non secundum scientiam* of the extreme enthusiasts.

Those who are interested in the alleged appearances of Our Lady at Beauraing will read with interest a criticism by Fr. J. Lenain, S.J., in NOUVELLE REVUE THEOLOGIQUE for October, which tends towards conceding the truth of the apparitions. The most weighty attack on the supernatural character of these events is Dr. De Greeff's in ETUDES CARMELITAINES and SAINT LUC MEDICAL. Fr. Lenain, very moderately and objectively, passes a judgment on Dr. de Greeff's inquiry, and on the natural explanation which he feels compelled to give of these phenomena. He concludes by setting out the theological *criteria* to be employed in all such cases. By temperate discussion of this kind, *pro* and *con*, the way will be opened to a definitive judgment of the Church on these events which, whatever the ultimate decision may be, have certainly attracted wide-spread interest throughout the Catholic world. In the same number Fr. Gemelli, O.F.M., and Fr. Vermeersch, S.J., appear to have concluded the discussion concerning *Indirect Abortion* which has been running in this periodical for some time.

GREGORIANUM sustains its reputation for learning and research in fasc. 3 of 1933. There is a contribution by Fr. S. Tromp on *Bellarmino's Disputationes De Predestinatione*, and by Fr. Pelster on the *Quaestiones* of the English mediæval theologian *Alexander of Hales*. Fr. Pelster explains very fully and most attractively the way in which the writings of the Fathers have

been preserved, utilized, and transmitted to later generations, particularly the part played by the great libraries of Jerusalem and Caesarea and the private collections, whether of individuals such as Photius, or of churches such as Toledo. The articles in this number are in five different languages, including a note on Tertullian in English, by Fr. B. Leeming; and a reviewer who does not claim to be a linguist is thankful for the Latin summary of each contribution, a practice which for many other reasons is worthy of imitation.

The most useful DOCUMENTATION CATHOLIQUE (n. 674, 676) gives, in the form of a dossier, an admirable summary of the present state of opinion, in various countries, concerning the State sterilization of the unfit. So much of the printed discussion on this subject consists of the vaguest generalities, that we are unusually grateful for such definite information as the text of the German Law (July, 1933), the criticism of it on the part of Catholic and non-Catholic authorities in Germany and elsewhere, and a clear indication of the state of the question in countries, other than Germany, which either have sterilizing laws or are contemplating such measures, owing to Eugenist propaganda—which is the position in our own country.

The HOMILETIC REVIEW continues to give prominence to the very puzzling question of the use of the Safe Period as recently explained by Ogino and Knaus. The articles are written by Dr. Guchteneere, the leading Catholic authority on the whole question of Birth Control, and the November number deals with the practical application of the theory and its security, if properly applied. Quite apart from the moral implications, the chief medical puzzle is to decide on the security of the method in cases which are not normal in the monthly cycle. Dr. Guchteneere's experience is that of Dr. Smulders, namely, only very rarely has he met a cycle so irregular that the method was not applicable. The writer thinks that a knowledge of this method will undoubtedly prevent numerous couples from having recourse to contraception in future, but it will cure only a very small proportion of those who have been for a long time slaves to the vice.

The October CATHOLIC MEDICAL GUARDIAN contains, in addition to its usual features and reviews, an account of the *Catholic Doctors' Conference in Dublin*, an article on *Diabolical Possession* by Fr. Howell, S.J., and further criticism of the *De Rudder* cure at Lourdes, which for nearly sixty years has been considered as setting the seal upon the claims of Lourdes as a source of miraculous cures. Dr. F. M. R. Walshe is by no means completely satisfied. "Probably the most cautious estimate of the story would be that the elements of which it is composed are not sufficient to justify the invoking of the supernatural."

E. J. M.

CORRESPONDENCE

MISSA DIALOGATA.

May I give a quotation from Bishop Whiteside's Synod of 1905 *à propos* of Canon Dolman's query?

"The Council of Trent would have the pastor of souls explain during the Mass something about the mystery that is being enacted, and about the prayers said at Mass.

"An excellent way, followed in a number of the churches of the diocese, is for one of the priests to go into the pulpit during the children's Mass, and following the priest at the altar to explain what is going on, and to say appropriate prayers along with all present. The method may be varied, and there is no lack of books to help the priest, e.g., Fr. Hill's *Prayer Book The Garden of the Soul*, Cardinal Vaughan's book on the Mass Bishop Hay's *Pious Christian*.

"It is not advisable to do this every Sunday, otherwise the people who usually attend the children's Mass may not bring their prayer books with them, which they should be taught to have and to use."

In a previous paragraph of the same Synod he has an apt remark concerning hymns, etc.

"To assist at Mass with attention and devotion, the faithful must have their minds and hearts united with the priest at the altar. . . . It should be obvious to all that to sing hymns, most of which have no reference to the great Action, to say the rosary, or other favourite prayers, is not calculated to help a person to keep united with the intentions of the Holy Sacrifice."

His Lordship asked the clergy to do what they could "to put a stop to this degrading of the assembly of the faithful for the great sacrifice of the New Law into a mere prayer meeting."

JOSEPH MCKENNA.

ERRATA.

In Fr. McKenna's article on the Quarant' Ore in the September issue, at page 199, "if a Solemn High Mass is sung" should read, "if Solemn High Mass or Missa Cantata is sung," and in the fourteenth line, "If Missa Cantata or Low Mass is allowed by the Ordinary" should read, "If Low Mass is allowed by the Ordinary."

Permissu Superiorum.

o
t
i
o
n
t
n
n
k
ss
h
ng
to
p
ful
the
ost
ry
o. n

out
for
g."
.

ber
uld
in
ved
the